

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make
orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:—	
An Evangelical 'Lux Mundi'	165
The New Reformation	166
The Americanization of Christianity	168
Canon Barnes on Modernism	171
The Church of the Future	173
Religious Authority	176
Miss M. D. Petre.	
The New Testament and Modern Criticism ..	186
W. F. Howard, B.D.	
Sin and the Modern Mind	197
R. V. G. Tasker, B.A.	
Book Reviews:—	
The Wrong and the Right Way	205
A Disciple of Modernism	207
A Journalistic Life of Christ	208
Christ's Challenge to Youth	209
Two Books on Philosophy	211
Correspondence:—	
Contradictory Dogma	212
Brigadier-General Carter, C.B.	
Books for Parents and Children, etc. ..	215
The American Heresy Hunt	216



OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: SOUTH AFRICA—T. MASKEW MILLER, Cape Town.

NEW ZEALAND—WALTER NASH, 110-112 Lambton Quay, Wellington.

IF YOU REQUIRE

The finest Wines, Spirits Cigars and Tobacco,
The best quality Provisions, Groceries & Confectionery
Combined with prompt and courteous attention,
Then you will save money, trouble and time
by ordering from

GRIMBLY HUGHES & CO. LD. THE CORNMARKE STORES,
OXFORD.

Telephone "Oxford Four.

QUALITY



SERVICE

THE MITRE HOTEL, OXFORD.

THIS well-known Hotel for Families and Gentlemen, which is situate in the centre of the finest street in Europe, close to the Colleges, and within an easy distance of the river, has been enlarged and much improved. While the traditional antiquity of the building has been carefully preserved, visitors will find in it all the refined comforts of a MODERN HOTEL. The MITRE is largely patronized by distinguished English, American, and Continental Visitors, and is recognised as one of the best first-class Hotels in the United Kingdom.

Dining, Drawing, Reading and Smoking Rooms, Lounge, Good Suites of Rooms, and
Four Spacious Billiard Rooms.

Electric Light. A Night Porter in attendance.

Tariff on application to C. J. VERT, Manager.

Telephone 335. Telegrams: 'Mitre,' Oxford.

HOOKHAM & COMPANY,

Clerical Outfits for Home or Colonial Wear.

Academical Robe Makers.

TAILORS, SHIRTMAKERS, HOSIERS, HATTERS.

3 CORNMARKE, OXFORD.

TAILORS
SINCE 1846.

CASTELL & SON.

OUTFITTING
ADDED IN 1873.

University and Clerical Tailors,
Robe Makers,

13 BROAD STREET, OXFORD.

(Opposite Balliol College).

Representatives of the Firm are frequently travelling, and appointments
are respectfully solicited.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*.

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke*.

No. 4.

JULY, 1923.

VOL. XIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

An Evangelical *Lux Mundi*.

The appearance of *Liberal Evangelicalism—an Interpretation* by Members of the Church of England* emphasizes in a very definite way the extent to which liberalism has permeated the minds of the younger and abler Evangelicals. The *Church Times* complains that it foreshadows the end of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England, and that the three historic Anglican parties will now become two. The *Church Times* is probably right, but it is not very kind in its manner of asserting it. We have long foreseen that in all denominations the older party divisions will be re-marshalled under two heads, Traditionalist and Modernist, and then at a later date under one.

The contributors to *Liberal Evangelicalism* are resolved, while holding fast to the personal religion of their fathers, to stand for truth rather than tradition in theological and ecclesiastical questions. This decision is expressed by them in quite unambiguous terms in the following paragraphs taken from the Introduction:—

‘The writers believe that there is at the present moment a real controversy for the soul of the Church of England. There is a clash of ideals, of differing conceptions of authority, of different views of the methods of God’s working; carried far enough back, it might even be described as the clash of different ideas about the nature of God. With controversy on this plane the writers are necessarily concerned, though, in entering upon it, they would disclaim, and seek to cast out wholly, any spirit of partisanship. Let the truth, and the truth alone, prevail.’

Liberals as they read this refreshing declaration by their Evangelical brethren feel like our war-worn countrymen when

*Published by Hodder & Stoughton, price 6/- (1923).

the peoples of the United States finally decided where honour and freedom required them to stand in the late war. Liberalism needs the warm personal religion of Evangelicalism, and the historic and corporate sense of Catholicism; both Evangelicalism and Catholicism need on their part that serious belief in the truth, and in a present-day revelation of the Holy Spirit which is the bedrock conviction of Liberalism; and Modernism strives for the synthesis of the three, and not, we believe, in vain.

The essays deal in a most clear and reasonable and untechnical way with all the main subjects of theological interest, and may be warmly commended to the educated laity. The essay which perhaps attracts us most by its consistency and courage is that on 'The Presentation of the Gospel Abroad,' by Principal A. W. Davies, of St. John's College, Agra. He therein indicates the methods which alone can secure the evangelisation of the educated Oriental. He writes:—

'It (the Evangelical party) will have to set its missionaries free to apply the methods of historical criticism to all sacred Scriptures, and to teach its generally-accepted conclusions, in order that the evident inspiration of the Bible may shine out by its own light, and that Christianity may gain the tremendous advantage of being the one religion that fearlessly invites the applications of the most rigorous scientific, philosophical and historical tests . . . It must be prepared to recognize essential unity in Christ with people and parties who express their loyalty to Him in unfamiliar ways, and, while honestly combating what it holds to be their errors, must find room for them in its conception of the Catholic Church' (p. 285).

The other contributors of essays are the Bishops of Truro and Hereford, Dean Burroughs, Canons H. A. Wilson, Guy Rogers, E. W. Barnes and V. F. Storr, the Principals of Wycliffe Hall and St. Aidan's College, the Revs. E. S. Woods and J. W. Hunkin—a goodly company, among whom we recognise some valued members of the Churchmen's Union.

The New Reformation.

As the Protestant attack on Romanism has died away in English Church circles, it is interesting to note the revival of the Romanist attack on Anglicanism. There was serious need for facing this, and a book of essays which deals weightily and trenchantly with mediaeval and modern Romanism and the principles of the English Reformation has just been published

under the title of *Anglican Essays*.* Among its contributors are Archbishop D'Arcy, Mr. G. G. Coulton, and Mr. C. E. Raven. Mr. Coulton's essay on 'Rome as unreformed' contains a scathing, but as he proves, well-deserved indictment of Romanist controversial methods. He points out that while both Romanist and anti-Romanist controversialists have been guilty of sins against accuracy and candour, the mark of the Romanist is that he does not acknowledge his error and withdraw it. He and his Church, if they do not continue to repeat the false statement, take refuge in silence. They never acknowledge that they have erred.

Mr. Raven, who deals with 'The New Reformation,' holds that its primary duty is to put 'first things first,' and then to make an earnest endeavour to express them in terms of our own time. It is refreshing to find one who sees clearly that Church Reform must begin with the most difficult of all reforms which even many saintly men and women abhor, namely, theological reform. Practical reforms are much more popular and much easier to propose, for no *odium theologicum* attaches itself to them. 'The fatal opulence of bishops' may be a popular object for reform with many good Churchmen, but not the fatal opulence of formularies. As Mr. Raven truly remarks:—

'For Catholics and Evangelicals the mere admission that certain aspects of religion require restatement is tantamount to a confession of disloyalty: to be willing to unite with members of another school is to become a suspect and an outcast. Fear of splitting the party, fear of offending the consciences of the simple, fear of being accused of Modernism, fear that one's own faith will not survive exposure to fresh light, all these make it hard even for sincere students to speak their minds freely' (p. 264).

Yet it must be done, but it can only be done effectively by those who have thought their way through, and what a long and painful process that is, and how few there are capable of doing it. For again, as Mr. Raven truly remarks:—

'Yet even a concentration on fundamentals is no simple matter. For during the century of renaissance through which she (the Church of England) has been passing . . . she has hardly yet realized the vast contribution of the new learning to religion or the importance

**Anglican Essays*. The Anglican Communion as Catholic and Reformed. By the Archbishop of Armagh, Rev. R. H. Murray, G. G. Coulton, Ven. W. L. P. Cox, Ven. J. H. Thorpe, Rev. C. E. Raven, Most Rev. H. Lowther Clarke, and extracts from the Pastorals of Bishop Jayne. Published by Macmillans, price 10/6 net (1923).

of interpreting her central truth afresh in the light of it . . . The new physical sciences have rendered untenable the traditional ideas of authority, of the supernatural, of miracles, and in fact of the whole method of God's operation : mechanical notions of inspiration, whether of the Bible or of the Councils of the first millennium, magical theories of prayer or of sacraments, doctrines of divine impassibility imported from Greek philosophy or of divine ruthlessness and caprice inherited from the Old Testament, and concepts of deity borrowed from earthly palaces or camps or law courts—to insist upon these is to brand oneself as either ignorant or insincere. The new history has profoundly modified the traditional portrait of Christ . . . The new philosophy has made the traditional language of dogmatic theology almost unintelligible . . . The new psychology is challenging many of the traditional concepts as to the nature and relationships of men, of the character of sin and the process of salvation : moral theology needs revision almost as badly as dogma' (pp. 261-3).

The task is a tremendous one. It not only demands highly trained minds and experienced teachers; it also demands a really sympathetic atmosphere—and not one of tacit opposition or public condemnation, and this sympathetic atmosphere we have not yet got in Church circles.

Yet it is good to learn that Mr. Raven does not despair of the republic, neither do Modernists, or they would cease to be Modernists. We agree entirely with him when he writes :

'Beliefs will be re-stated, machinery overhauled, scandals removed, and the Reformation accomplished . . .'

but not all at once, nor perhaps without a good deal more effort than we are making at present, and a good deal more courage.

The Americanization of Christianity.

The newly-founded *Congregational Quarterly*, which increases in range and variety of interest with each successive number, contains in its July issue a significant article by Dr. Adams Brown, of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, on 'Movements of Promise in the American Churches.' These movements are three, and may be classified thus :

- (1) the effort to lay the foundation for a united and effective ministry in a co-operative study of the theoretical problems which now divide Christians.
- (2) the use of the federative principle to secure common action :
- (3) the new interest shown in the social application of religion :

The first movement has brought together the leaders and thinkers of the various Protestant denominations, and has produced five volumes of 'findings' and a number of pamphlets. This is valuable educational work.

The second movement has led to the creation of Community Churches. This movement takes many different forms. Sometimes it consists in the combination of all the Protestant sects in a locality into a single congregation: sometimes in the withdrawal of all the existing sectarian organizations except one: sometimes a fresh start is made in the Christian life of the locality and a new Church organized. These Union or Community or Federated Churches, as they are variously called, are growing rapidly in numbers. In the State of Vermont, eighty Churches in thirty-eight localities have gone on a Community basis in four years. The movement has naturally led to a great increase in ecclesiastical co-operation in civic and social activity.

Whilst here in England, we have been rather unhappily sacrificing the parish to the congregation, the American effort is seeking to revive the ideal of the parish, which Dr. Adams Brown declares to be 'that most salutary old-world institution of which our denominationalism has so largely robbed us.'

A similar co-operative development is going on in the administrative and missionary agencies. A significant feature of the missionary activity of the American Church is the increasing part taken in its management by women, sometimes by means of women's boards, sometimes by mixed boards. Of course American Protestantism, with the exception of the Episcopal Church, freely admits women to the ministry. The old barriers of every kind in ecclesiastical life are rapidly falling in America. It is impossible yet to say what the result of this many-sided co-operative ecclesiastical movement will be. It may even lead ultimately to the creation of a National Church. Dr. Adams Brown writes:

'In the new agencies which are being created, and still more in the new spirit which is creating them, it may well be that we see the first beginnings of a National Church—a Church which, federal in name, and in the philosophy of its organization, may yet, in its sense of spiritual unity and in its power to deal with great questions in a large way, become as truly an example of organic unity as the nation which came to birth in a similar way.'

The third movement with which Dr. Adams Brown deals is by no means novel to English Churchmen (seeing that the Christian Social Movement originated here some eighty years

ago), but it appears to be becoming more and more popular in America. Now whilst the benefits of the Community Church, and the Institutional Church, and the Educational Church are manifest, we are not so clear as to the benefits of the Socialist Church which has for its object 'the Christianizing of the social order.' No doubt there is much in our present social order, both here and in America, which is hostile to the advancement of the Kingdom of God, and detrimental to the ideal development of the individual, and it is important that this should be reformed; but the question is: By whom and how? Is it better done by the Christian Church in its corporate capacity or by combinations of citizens inspired by the Christian spirit? We believe the second to be the better method. There are two dangers which arise from the corporate endeavour of the Church to 'Christianize the social order.'

The first is that the Church in its efforts to organize industrial, political, and international life on Christian lines, may neglect its primary duty of converting and building up the individual as a child of God.

And secondly, the Church may lose spirituality, character, and weight by becoming involved in various economic, social, and political disputations which seem to turn the Christian pastor into a demagogue and political agitator.

Whilst Dr. Adams Brown views with satisfaction the efforts of the Churches in America to 'Christianize the social order,' he does not seem aware of the dangers and disadvantages which these efforts involve. 'The mobilization of public opinion' by the Churches is a very poor substitute for that patient pastoral work by which Christian personalities are created. Church Congresses and Conferences which put forth the social ideals of the Churches dealing with wages and hours of labour, sanitation and unemployment, international justice and goodwill, the proper relation of races to each other, undoubtedly serve a useful purpose, but it would be seriously detrimental for the rank and file of the clergy to regard these as the great things in the Church's work and the cure of souls as the small things. This seems to us to be the dangerous aspect of the Americanization of the Christian Church: and those who know best what is going on in Christian circles in America tell us that the pas-

toral quality of the American clergy is declining. If this be so, no public advocacy of new economic theories or reformed political methods can form an adequate substitute for it. Let us *extend* the Kingdom of God by all worthy means, but let us beware of *distending* it with windy economic programmes and hot-air political oratory. The most pressing task that awaits the Church to-day is not to Christianize the social order, but to Christianize itself and its members.

Canon Barnes on Modernism.

The *Challenge*, which we are glad to observe, is reviving its interest in ecclesiastical affairs, has just completed the publication of a series of six articles on Modernism by Canon Barnes of Westminster.

Canon Barnes goes for his definition of Modernism, not as is usual to George Tyrrell, but to William Sanday.

'I do not disclaim the name of Modernist . . . The name describes justly what I aim at being. I aim at thinking the thoughts and speaking the language of my own day, and yet at the same time keeping all that is essential in the religion of the past . . . ' 'The ultimate goal of Modernism is the unification of thought, the fusion of all secular thinking and all religious thinking in one comprehensive and harmonious system.'

Canon Barnes claims that English Modernism is both sincere and loyal, and above all it is Christocentric. He writes:

'Its leaders have shown that, like Englishmen in general, they take their religion seriously. They wish to restate the Christian faith so that it may be cogent to their fellow-men, an inspiration to right living and an incentive to spiritual aspiration. Moreover, Modernist teaching can claim to be loyal to the Christian tradition because it emphasises that Christ gave supremely true guidance to spiritual understanding, and that only by obedience to His ethical principles can man reach the end for which he was created by God. Modernism in England is thus Christocentric.'

Canon Barnes makes one point of particular interest; he asserts quite correctly that it is often assumed that English Modernism is a development of the Broad Church Theology of Arnold, Maurice, and Stanley, but he maintains that Dr. Hort (1828—1892) was the real father of English Modernism. In Hort's 'Notes and Illustrations' appended to *The Way, the Truth and the Life*, published in 1893, he finds the great principles of present-day Modernism enunciated. He writes:

'A few quotations will show both the grasp of Hort's mind and the true character of English Modernism . . . To Hort Christianity

was not "an uniform and monotonous tradition": it was "to be learned only by successive steps of life": the Christian teacher has to recognise "a duty of perpetual correction, perpetual progress."
 "There can be no surer sign of decrepitude and decay in faith than a prevalent nervousness about naming and commending reason . . ."
 "The fear of doing injury by a bold policy is perversely fallacious . . ."
 "Criticism is not dangerous save when it is merely the tool for reaching a result believed on the ground of speculative postulates."

Canon Barnes points out, and the situation has become clearer since Hort's day, that in the re-adjustment of the Christian theology which Hort had in view there are 'two ultimate positions, not proved, but likely to be true.'

'The first, that "man with his whole mental and spiritual nature has been derived through various steps from lower beings having no such nature, and those probably in turn from inorganic bodies."

'The second, that "man's whole mental and spiritual nature is conditioned by his physical nature and its pathological states, no mental or spiritual movement taking place without a concomitant physical movement."

Until we have a clear and convincing Christian theology which admits these two positions, we shall not win the younger generation of educated men and women. Not the least of the services of Modernism is that it is demonstrating practically that not a materialist atheism or a barren agnosticism but a vigorous Christian theism can be firmly held with an unflinching acceptance of evolution.

Hort, as Canon Barnes points out, had no sympathy with those who seek to disengage an imaginary Christ from the flesh and blood of the historical Gospel.

'For him (Hort) the central fact of Christianity is that God lived in His Son Jesus Christ. Thus "belief in Christ is not a supplement to belief in God, but the only sure foundation of it." "Christianity consists of the most central and significant truth concerning the Universe, intelligible only in connection with other truth not obviously Christian and accepted by many not Christians."

On the Modernist attitude towards miracles Canon Barnes has several interesting things to say. He cites with approval Dean Inge's statements that 'the historicity of the miracles in the Gospels and the creeds is a scientific and not a religious question,' and that 'it is an undetected residue of materialism to make our belief in Christ as a living and lifegiving Spirit depend on any abnormal occurrences in the physical world.' Here, says Canon Barnes, 'I hesitate to follow him.' All that Modernists ask in this matter is that the Church authorities

shall not insist on a belief in miracles as a necessary postulate of Christian faith. If the Church does insist, then in view of the present trend in scientific and historical studies, it will continue to repel first-rate students from the Christian ministry. At present the touch-stone of orthodoxy in Church circles is belief in miracles. However unorthodox you may be, if you affirm your belief in miracles you will be accepted as orthodox. If you cannot affirm your belief in them you are regarded as heretical. Modernists, whether of the right or of the left, will never rest satisfied until this pressure is taken off miracles as it has been taken off plenary verbal inspiration.

Canon Barnes does not think that a system of Modernist theology has yet been formulated, but inclines to believe that it is adumbrated in Dean Inge's *Confessio Fidei* in the second series of *Outspoken Essays*.

The Church of the Future.

Many of recent years, ranging from Father Hugh Benson to Dr. John Hunter, have made predictions about the Church of the future. St. Ethelburga's Press has issued a pamphlet with that title in which Dr. Cobb discusses the same theme. For him the Church is what it was for Bishop Creighton, 'mankind knowing and fulfilling its destiny.' For him

'Church History is something better than a mere story of how the ecclesiastical spirit from the days of Ignatius of Antioch onwards has succeeded in killing off its rivals that it may reign supreme in the domain of cult and creed and organized philanthropy. . . . What really gives meaning to Church history is the Life which is ever working in and through it.'

Dr. Cobb believes that the destiny of man is spiritualization and that this is a process. 'It doth not yet appear what we shall be.' Nevertheless, there are factors in this process, and the Church has to do with all of them: Art, Science, Politics, Theology, Worship. Of politics, he writes:

'Politics may rise from a dirty trade to the loftiest activity of men, if a spiritual end be substituted for a material. If the art of government be to make men happy, then modern governments must be judged by their failure, and their failure can best be accounted for by remembering that man does not live by bread alone, but that all these things are added to peoples, as to persons, who seek first the Kingdom of God. Jesus Christ may be passed by as an Idealist, but, at all events, His idealism is the only principle of living which

stands unshaken in the crash of empires, and systems of thought, and social institutions, and when His true Church takes its true place politics will become a department of Church work instead of being to the Church a Nero, a Gallio, or a Hildebrand.'

Of theology he has something equally pertinent to say :

'The theologian of to-day is regarded as a Dryasdust, a diletante amusing himself with collecting dead bones, or constructing fairy castles of thought, and in a tolerant age people leave him alone and decline to take him seriously. No positive condemnation could be more severe than this tacit neglect, for it proves theology to have deserted the facts of the spiritual world for the fancies of the intellectual, to have buried itself in the past instead of using the present to fashion the future. Yet the present age surpasses all previous ages in the supply of material it offers to the theologian who can see life steadily, and see it whole, and has the wit to see that he has something better to do than to compile a *Liber Sententiarum* out of Athanasius, Cyril, and Leo, *viz.*, the co-ordination into a harmonious whole of what the present has discovered of the spiritual in the realm of the phenomenal. Can it be said that Christian theology has yet absorbed the doctrine of the Uniformity of Law, of the Conservation of Energy, the principle of Evolution, the facts of psychic phenomena, the results of the investigations of the science of comparative religion, of anthropology, or of biology? Yet, surely, all these are manifestations of the spiritual, and call loudly upon the Church of to-day to sift out the chaff and put the wheat into its garner, as its legacy to the Church of the Future.'

Of public worship, he writes :

'The Church has spoiled the Egyptians for the construction of her ceremonial system, not without opposition from large groups of her members, and not yet has the strife about it been quieted. But there is clearly visible a desire to end the quarrel by an appeal to something else beside rubrics, canons or decrees on the one side, or private judgment on the other. Ceremonial, it is felt, must be judged by the service it is able to render in the development of the spiritual life of those who use it, and when once this feeling gets the upper hand the conclusion will be reached that the infinite grades of spiritual life require the utmost possible elasticity in the ceremonial it employs. "*Non uno itinere perveniri potest ad tam grande secretum.*"'

Dr. Cobb thinks that there are three things especially which stand between the Church and the realisation of its destiny: first, a want of knowledge of the spiritual basis of things: the promise and potency of true life lies in that knowledge. He places second 'the spirit of narrow self-complacency.'

'This,' he writes, 'is incarnated in Christian Churches of all sorts. It lets down the blinds on God's sunshine, and makes men wrangle in a darkened room about shadows, when air and light would still them into worship of Eternal Beauty. What interest can disputes about Orders, the validity of Infant Baptism, the mode of God's presence, whether this or that, about the persons who shall give instruction in theology to babes, nice points of history, have for the

man who sees spirit functioning everywhere and lives by the joy which the vision gives him?'

For Dr. Cobb the third hindrance is the spirit of dogmatism.

'What else,' he asks, 'is the dogmatic spirit, accompanied (as it always is) by intolerance, self-righteousness, party-strife and narrow-heartedness, but a manifestation of the spirit of Antichrist which the Christ came to exorcise.'

Dr. Cobb's summary may please the Quaker or the Modernist, but the Catholic, who regards the structure of the Church as one of the essentials of the Divine Revelation to mankind, will not be attracted by it. It runs thus:

'If this be so, then the conclusion is forced on us that the work which lies before the Church reformer is not to tinker existing systems, but to work for a constitution fitted for the new and yet old spirit. New wine demands new wine-skins, and the spirit of life (being essentially anti-dogmatic) requires a Church not founded on dogmas, but trusting to the divine life to lead it, keep it, inspire it, and crown it.

'Of course to many a proposal to dispense with dogma, that is, with doctrines enforced by authority as conditions of membership in an ecclesiastical body, will seem mere midsummer madness, making Chaos umpire sit. So it is. But the question here is not of an ecclesiastical, that is a semi-political body, but of a Church as a body of persons who have been born again of the Spirit, and know that the Spirit is a spirit of order as well as of life. The Church of the Future will be a spiritual Church, not an ecclesiastical corporation, and, consequently, it will dispense with dogmas, just as it will have thrown off the dogmatic spirit, as being but one of the many disguises of materialism.

'Were this one arch enemy slain the Churches would then devote themselves to their proper work of inculcating spiritual truth and extending the religion of humanity. Even as it is the Christian conscience, outside the Church and within it, is insisting that the community which speaks in the name of Christ shall return to His spirit, and devote itself to His work.'

What the Christian world needs are (1) common convictions—very few, very simple, very deep, very inspiring; (2) a common aim—the setting before itself the accomplishment of the same task, the attainment of the same ideal; (3) the possession of the same spirit—one of faith, hope, love. These things will secure Christian unity and Christian effectiveness, but they will not, so far as we can see, secure uniformity of organization or uniformity of Church rites, and still less uniformity of thought on a multitude of questions which have vexed Christian theologians in the past, but which we may well hope the Church of the future will cease to regard as either needful or desirable.

RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY

By Miss M. D. PETRE, author of *The Life of George Tyrrell*.

'Is your wisdom such that you do not see that your country is more to be revered and is holier and in higher esteem among the gods and among men of understanding than your mother and your father and all your ancestors, and that you ought to show to her more reverence and obedience and humility when she is angry than to your father, and ought either to convince her by persuasion, or to do whatever she commands, and to suffer, if she commands you to suffer, in silence.'

A GOOD many of us are pondering somewhat sadly over our early hopes in the light of present happenings. It is better to learn what has to be learned than to shut our eyes for the sake of personal consistency; and those who have to suffer disappointment in their ideals can at any rate take to themselves this consolation, that they have a fuller understanding of what *can* be done, through their efforts to do more than *could* be done. Yet it must be admitted that words which came confidently from the mouths of many in early life have taken on a doubtful significance; we still know what we want, but we are more doubtful as to the right way of getting it. Then, too, we are faced with the horrible rightness of what we still know to be wrong, but hardly dare to call such in face of the chaos which has been brought about by the evil methods adopted for its overthrow.

See, for instance, how the prophets and advocates of permanent militarism are having their way even after the war which was to end wars.

See how the attempted reconstruction of a country on new social principles has ended in a terrible tyranny in Russia.

See too the havoc which has temporarily ensued in a neighbouring land, so soon as her national demands were granted, and the reins of self-government confided to her.

See how labour yet fails to produce such a wise and coherent policy as can inspire general confidence.

See the misuse of the term democracy—see how men are struggling in the toils of their own systems, and how little the people, any more than their rulers, have the courage and gener-

osity that are needed to free themselves from a vast economic slavery.

Europe is perishing for want of the two fundamental factors of social life—sound authority, true liberty. We see that votes do not confer liberty; that under a so-called democratic form of government the best men and women may have as little, or less, opportunity than under king or emperor; that light and truth may be extinguished as readily by the vote of a majority as by the tyranny of an autocrat.

Worst of all, we begin to have a dread sense of chance and fate in political happenings, as though direction were lacking, and the many conflicting needs wrought to the production of such results as nobody wants.

Were the intransigents right all the time? Was the world really intended to consist of have-alls and do-alls; of comfortable rich and uncomfortable but contented poor; of rulers who decided everything and subjects who did what they were told? Is war a necessary factor of social life, and physical force the true solvent of political problems? Is it so dangerous to oppose the extravagances of authority, to claim for the individual mind and will a fitting measure of liberty and independence, that it is better to suppress the claim to self-government and to tolerate the blindness of unchecked authority?

This problem is religious as well as political, and the ecclesiastical 'die-hards' can make as strong a case as their political counterparts. They have triumphed over Modernism in all its shades, the Modernism that was threaded through with doubt as the Modernism that was instinct with faith, and they have triumphed by pleading the danger of the least departure from precedent; the least attempt to qualify and moderate the exigencies of authority.

Many say that Roman Catholic Modernism is *déad*. They are right in so far as they mean that a complex movement, impelled from widely differing sources, has lost its cohesion by the inevitable dispersal of its various and often contradictory factors.

It is true also that the counter movement has triumphed in the Roman Catholic Church; that many who hoped for a renovation of her life have ceased to hope; that many who adhered

to a desperate cause have ceased to adhere, and have abandoned what seemed to them a false and futile position.

But it is a far cry from this admission to the pessimistic conclusion that the movement is dead so far as the Roman Catholic Church is concerned. If Catholicism continues at all it can no more permanently exclude modern thought from its schools than it can exclude the surrounding air from its buildings. The Church may reject golden opportunities of gathering humanity under her wings, but she cannot reject humanity itself.

There were many reasons why Roman Catholic Modernism, as a movement, came to an end: it had no collective *Credo*, no collective *Programme*; it was a movement, not an institution, and a movement has no concrete existence. It is obviously the destiny of knowledge to be ever superseded, and the science of our age will be, in many respects, childishness to the science of some hundreds of years hence. Yet this most obvious and general statement should be accompanied by two further observations. First of all, if our philosophy is to be transcended, it will only be after it has been in some manner absorbed—it will pass because it is *dépassé* and it cannot be *dépassé* till it has had its full say. Hence opposition only serves to lengthen its existence; few systems perish by sheer violence, and ordinarily they must mature before they die. Secondly, there is one leading principle of modern philosophy which will not perish simply because it is itself the discovery of the principle of imperishability—the discovery, that is to say, of the law of eternal movement. We shall live on just because we know we have, in part, to die; because our philosophy is the philosophy of life and action and movement, and not of a fixed and immovable truth; because we have found that the law of life is also the law of death. This characteristic principle of modern religious philosophy may eventually become a truism, but it can never become a dead formula.

But as regards Modernism, I cannot but think that the actual life of the movement itself might have been prolonged had the various parties it comprehended sought a principle of union, not in any collective statement of beliefs or needs, but in a collective attitude as to the rights and limits of authority.

In so far as Modernists believed in the Church at all, they must have recognised the need of some form of authority, some measure of obedience; in so far as they laid claim to rightful freedom in their own special domain of human knowledge, they must have required a limitation and adjustment of religious authority in the questions that were outside its bounds.

In Church as in State the pure anarchist is a despairing pessimist or a credulous optimist, and common-sense is with neither of these extremes. In Church as in State authority is an organ of life, but only in so far as it is also an organ of liberty.

This, then, appears to me the crucial question for those who love both religion and truth, and who also believe that religion must be incorporated in some institution. No institution can exist without some principle of authority; and though there are many who think that the principles of democracy contain a satisfactory solution of the problem of authority, that the existing social evils will disappear just in proportion as the will of the people takes the place of the will of king or class, there are others for whom authority contains its own problem, irrespective of the source whence it emanates, or the tribunal on which it is enthroned.

Dante believed in an universal monarchy precisely as being the surest organ of freedom; the supreme guarantee of universal peace. No modern idealist has a keener desire for universal brotherhood, world-wide peace, legitimate freedom, than this mediaeval Italian, who judged that only by means of an universal monarchy could such goods be assured; could democracies, oligarchies and tyrannies be held in place.

Modern political reformers are too much occupied with the outward form that authority assumes; too little occupied with a study of its actual nature and laws. The same is true in regard to ecclesiastical authority. It is not the conferring of a voting power on the laity that will secure a sound rule; it is a true conception of the rights and limits of authority itself that is needed.

Now it is a not uncommon illusion on the part of those who raise the flag of lawful liberty to fancy that it is the force of prescriptive authority which opposes them, and the holders of authority alone with whom they have to count. This is true,

but only partly true. The path of freedom is blocked and impeded much more by those who wish to obey than by those who desire to command. There is no greater mistake than to suppose that the mass of mankind sincerely crave for liberty. They crave for comfort and convenience—they want to do as they please; but, *in the majority of cases*, they get more comfort and convenience and they do more readily what they please when they live in subjection than when they have the disposal of their own lives.

But this is not the only form of obedience that resists the efforts of the apostles of liberty. Here, again, we must study our subject in its highest, as in its mediocre forms. There is an obedience inspired by genuine love of the ideal; by the desire for self-donation in a cause higher than that of individual self-interest. Nowhere has this ideal been more nobly presented than in the *Servitude et Grandeur Militaires* of Alfred de Vigny—where, in the life of the soldier, we see examples of the highest self-abandonment along with the resulting tragedies in cases wherein this generosity of obedience is abused.

Now I maintain that no criticism of authority will be solid and useful that fails to take count of this tendency to obey—this twofold tendency—one springing from the natural sloth and dependence of many characters; the other from an ideal of self-sacrifice and self-devotion. Authority, in its manifold forms, can correspond to both these needs, as it can also disregard every legitimate need in the unworthy search for its own aggrandisement.

We have often had to admit the futility of efforts made to correct these excesses of authority by opposition to authority itself. Might it not be possible to set about our work in another way and to demonstrate the right limits of authority by teaching the right methods of obedience? If men could learn to obey *and to obey whole-heartedly, thus far, but no farther*, would not authority be, *ipso facto*, forced into its proper dimensions?

The ordinary remedy is that of rebellion—a rebellion which may, indeed, be quite legitimate. But though we can, on these lines, rectify certain individual injustices, we shall obtain no general reform without employing positive as well as negative

methods. To tell men to rebel is to tell them not to obey; a profounder method of treatment is to teach them such a manner of obedience as will, in its own nature, find its own limits. Thus we shall obey, or cease to obey, on the same principle of right conduct; while those whose temperament and conscience do not fit them to assume an independent course of action will not be cast adrift on seas which they cannot navigate.

In questions of authority, as, indeed, in most questions, we shall find minimising tactics of little real service. The problem is not whether we are to obey a little more or a little less, it is in the very nature of obedience itself. Since, then, it is authority in its relation to religion with which we are here occupied, I will take as a text and example one of the most complete and extreme presentments of the doctrine of religious obedience that has ever been put forward, namely, the *Letter on Obedience*, addressed by St. Ignatius Loyola to the Society of Jesus in Portugal. In this document, just because it contains the doctrine of religious authority pure and undiluted, we shall be able to judge the question on its own true merits. It matters not, in this place, whether this document has been used more in the cause of absolutism or in that of liberty; what we want to extract from it is the highest interpretation of which it is capable, and, according to this interpretation, to judge where obedience should begin and where it should end; what we can gain by its noblest and most spiritual exercise, and what we can lose by a rigorous and mechanical application of its principles.

In this Letter there are three leading themes: first, that of the derivation of religious obedience; secondly, that of its degrees; thirdly, that of its end and object. As to the first, we are told how authority is derived by a chain of delegates, from God to the superior; but the subject is exhorted to ignore the intervening links, and see only the first ring of the chain, namely, God Himself.

I greatly desire, dear Brethren, that all those who serve God in this Society should be . . . distinguished by this mark, that they regard not the individual whom they obey, but in him Christ our Lord, for Whose sake they obey. For the Superior is not to be obeyed because he is prudent, or virtuous, or adorned with any other divine gift whatsoever; but for this only that he is the vicegerent of God, etc.

As to the second theme, there are, we are told, three degrees of obedience : that of merely external action, that of the will, and that of the intelligence ; and no obedience is perfect which does not comprise the three grades. It belongs, in fact, to the dignity of man to perform no action save as a spiritual being ; and external without internal submission is represented as an unworthy compromise, a disharmony and division of soul and body.

As to the third theme, we are shown that the object and end of religious authority, and, consequently, of religious obedience, is first of all the union of members one with another, and secondly the union of each one with God—brotherly love and divine love, consecration to humanity and consecration to God. The superior, individually, is nothing : be he wise or be he foolish, he can serve the end proposed. There is a certain proud independence in the very indifference that the subject is exhorted to manifest in regard to the personal attributes of his superior, whom he is to regard as a means and not an end.

Let us see what conclusion can be drawn from this three-fold exposition.

First of all, we see how emphatic is the distinction here suggested between religious and military obedience : the former being at once more complete and less rigorous : more exacting in its demands, and yet also more suggestive of its own limitations. The soldier is asked to pay outward respect, and may think what he chooses : religious obedience demands a tribute of the entire man, soul and body. But, if so, is it not equally evident that when the reason, a self-governing faculty, can go no further, the law must cease to bind (as, indeed, we find it said in the very document we are considering, when it speaks of the lawful resistance of conscience) ; and that when the will ceases to find in the commands of a superior that alone which it has sought by the adoption of religious obedience, namely, the means of self-donation to greater than private ends, it also reaches the term of its obligation and must direct itself anew ? So that it is precisely in the spirituality and entireness of obedience that we find the check of any possible extravagance.

Take, again, that point on which so much stress is laid of the personal unimportance of the superior, who may be recog-

nised as a fool even while we obey him and inwardly justify his commands. Here, again, we have not only a suggestion of law but also a suggestion of liberty; the superior is a means, and not an end; let him serve that end, and we follow him, whatever his personal characteristics may be; let him attempt to divert us from that end and we leave him for the same reason that we followed him. He stands in the place of God only in so far as he claims no place for himself; let him attempt to claim divine honours in his own right, and he is, *ipso facto*, a dethroned king.

Take, lastly, the end and object of religious obedience as set forth in that document, and we find again its profound difference from the military conception and also, more than ever, the true philosophy of its nature and limitations.

Its object is to unite us one with another, and to unite us all, individually and collectively, with the Divine Will. Hence its aim is the destruction of self-seeking and self interest, and the absorption of our narrower life into a wider and more universal one. In so far, then, as we follow this aim purely and disinterestedly we shall know when authority is fulfilling its duty in our regard, and when, on the contrary, it is guiding us to a false issue. That it should demand the sacrifice of our private interest is the very reason for its existence; that it should demand the sacrifice of our universal interests is to contradict every motive for obedience.

And how are we to be sure on this point? How are we to know when it is not mere selfish interest, but conscience, which bids us rebel?

Here we come to the point where the theory is clear and certain, while its application must depend on the lights of each one and the circumstances of each case. Every man must ask himself what aim he is seeking in his choice between the alternatives of rebellion and submission; and I will dare to say that he who, through the self-sacrifice of legitimate obedience, has most completely freed himself from the intrusion of petty and selfish motives, will be the best able to choose his path without fear of self-delusion. When we have lived for a common end, and have learned to forget ourselves in its prosecution, we shall

not fear that we are following secret caprice in our departure from the beaten road.

Hence I will say a word in defence of some, though not all, of those who have appeared to render unworthy submission to unjust acts of authority. They may not be as cowardly as some have lightly judged them to be. It may be that they are still seeking the greater good, though at the expense of their private dignity; and, provided there be no sacrifice of principle, this may be, for them, the higher course. This is not said to justify those whose acts of submission have been inspired by motives of worldly advantage.

What, then, in a few words, are the advantages and disadvantages of authority in religion? and what is the best way to enable those, who consider some form of religious authority necessary, to avail themselves of its use, and check its abuse?

Its main advantages are that it guides those who cannot guide themselves; that it stands for the principle of mutual love and union; that it directs minds, hearts, and wills out of the domain of narrow selfish existence into the exercise of a wider and more spiritual life, by the subjection of the private to the Divine and universal will.

Its disadvantages are that, being centred in limited beings, it can wander from its true course; can sacrifice individuals, not to a greater end, but to its own selfish ends; and that it can thus become a means of spiritual hindrance and oppression, and the seat of worldliness, falsehood, and expediency.

Now authority tends naturally to excess, and can never be expected to cure its own vices, while, on the other hand, the attempt to cure its sins by criticism of those who commit them is often doomed to failure. Therefore the more profitable course is to insist on the true nature and limits of obedience; to teach men in what genuine spiritual citizenship consists—its duties and its rights—its self-donation and its liberty. We can do nothing to check the superiors until we have the subjects on our side; and we shall not have the best of these on our side unless we recognise the advantages as well as the disadvantages of the authority to which they submit themselves. Let them learn to obey for a noble end, and not for mere sloth

and convenience, and they will learn also to resist when conscience demands it.

Therefore, in spite of the cruel lessons of life, my part shall not be with the Die-hards whether religious or political. Through however many failures some advance is discernible, and the temporary disasters may often be the result of Nature working by ruthless methods what men failed to achieve by peaceful ones. Few people know how to govern, but fewer still know how to be free, and this is not only because some have an exaggerated conception of liberty and others of authority, but also, and still more, because both sides actually under-rate while exaggerating their rights.

Dante believed in a supreme Monarch as he believed in a supreme Pontiff, but his universal monarchy was to be in the interests of universal peace and liberty as the Papacy was to be for spiritual light and life.

If the Papacy was, in any sense, as the Sun, to the Monarchy, which was the Moon, it was in so far as the greater light could illumine the lesser in its own independent course.

The human world is perishing for lack of a supreme principle of law and unity, which shall give peace. The Church could furnish such a principle of union, but not by methods of direct interference. She has a limited kingdom of her own in which she can govern according to her own laws; but she is also the representative of an unlimited kingdom which is not of this world. In this, her greatest mission, she exercises religious and not ecclesiastical authority; her rights are spiritual and not temporal. Asking nothing for herself, she can guide others; having no claim of her own she can promote universal peace. Her task is to turn the light of eternity on to the questions of time; to stand forth for the principle of disinterestedness in a world of conflicting interests. Spiritual ideals of charity and altruism are not directly and without qualification applicable to political questions; but in their light those questions are transformed, and become practically soluble. A true Society of Nations could not fulfil its mission without becoming, in some sense, a spiritual Church.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND MODERN CRITICISM*

By the Rev. W. F. HOWARD, B.D., Handsworth College, Birmingham.

WITHIN the last generation an entirely new attitude to the Bible has been taken up by those who most prize its unique contribution to the Christian religion and to our own spiritual life. Our forefathers moved in a world of infallibilities. If history and experience raised insurmountable objections to the ancient conception of an infallible Church, they had only to transfer the seat of authority to the sacred book. There was an external court of appeal, at which an irreversible decision could be sought and found. Of course this is not a fair statement of the historic position of the Protestant faith regarding Holy Scripture. The Reformers, Luther in particular, were far freer in their handling of the Bible than many of their successors who most loudly proclaim their loyalty to the Protestant succession. Be that as it may, the fact remains that within our lifetime a silent revolution has taken place in the Churches of Great Britain. Some of us are not old enough to remember the protracted controversy which raged round the writings of Professor William Robertson Smith. But it is only forty years since the Free Church of Scotland, which can boast the most highly trained and learned ministry in Christendom, dismissed from his chair that versatile scholar whose lasting glory it is to have first set before the seriously-minded lay public in this land the relation between the religious development of the Hebrews and the literary criticism of the Old Testament. But it is safe to say that since the Free Church of Scotland so disgraced itself, every teacher of the Old Testament in its colleges has built upon the foundations laid by Robertson Smith. Just a third of a century ago in the orthodox dovecotes of other gardens than that of the Church of England, there was fluttering when Dr. Gore and his brilliant group of colleagues brought out *Lux Mundi*, and accepted with all its theological implications the critical treatment of the Old Testa-

* A paper read before the Hertfordshire Branch of the Churchmen's Union.

ment. That volume of essays is said to have broken the heart of Canon Liddon, but it would be very hard to find a single figure who commands any authority in any Church in this land who to-day would regard *Lux Mundi* as a dangerous, or even as an advanced book. Let us, however, be chary of passing harsh criticism on the timorous souls who then shrank from accepting the new method. They said that the same method of critical enquiry would soon be applied to the New Testament, and where should we be then? They were quite right in their forecast, and if their timidity showed little confidence in the historic foundations of the Christian faith, it did at least testify to their sense of the supreme value of the faith. Nothing could be tolerated which might endanger the sacred deposit of truth. Our treasure might be in earthen vessels, but if clumsy or profane hands meddled with those vases they might be shattered to fragments and the treasure be lost. But now, for good or ill, the old idea of the Bible as an infallible book is for most people as dead as the pre-Copernican theory of the heavens. Some shake their heads and say this means that the authority of the Bible has been lost. Others testify with conviction that the inspiration of Scripture has now become a living experience. The plain man who is intelligent enough to be interested in the question sees both gain and loss in the new attitude to the Bible. With regard to the Old Testament, the gain is immense. But where do we really stand in relation to the New? Not a few earnest enquirers who desire to be loyal at all costs to the quest for truth are perplexed by much that they read and hear about the criticism of the Gospels, and begin to wonder if anything worth having is left. 'They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him.' For these dolorous souls the Sea of Faith was once at the full :

But now they only hear
Its melancholy, long, withdrawing roar,
Retreating, to the breath
Of the night-wind, down the vast edges drear
And naked shingles of the world.

In view of the very genuine distress into which some of our friends are flung by the progress of the critical investigation of the New Testament, it is well to call to mind two undeniable facts. The New Testament is the creation of a victorious faith.

It matters not how strange and seemingly fortuitous the process by which these surviving documents of the ancient Church came together at last into one book; they survive because they deserved to live; because they preserve for us as nothing else could do the first fine careless rapture of the Church which knew Jesus and the power of His resurrection, and so could challenge the world with its faith, fearless of hell and ghastly death and all the devildoms of that dark age. The second consideration is the living interest which the New Testament has for our own generation. The documentary study of the Gospels has not robbed our generation of an interest in the personality and life of Jesus. On the contrary, never has that interest been so keen since the days of the Apostles. Well has a recent writer said of the New Testament (himself an advanced critic), 'It has proved itself, and never more so than in these changeful days, to be the most living of all books. Its conceptions of man's needs and duties, of his relation to God and to his fellow-men, have stood every test, and are likely to be enduring.'¹

Now let us consider just what we mean by that well-known phrase, 'New Testament Criticism.' First we are concerned with the literature itself, examining the language and trying to discover from internal evidence the date, authorship, unity or complexity of each book, and its relation to any other book. This is called the literary criticism of the New Testament. Then we are led to enquire into the subject matter of the books, to find out how far the various authors give us a picture which exactly corresponds with the situation with which they are dealing, or to what extent they are influenced by contemporary conditions or are reflecting the doctrinal standards of their own age. It is by this process of historical criticism that we are gradually learning to reconstruct the story of the first Christian century, and are finding what a diversity of thought and worship there was in what we have sometimes thought of as a very simple and homogeneous community.

The scientific criticism of the New, as of the Old, Testament began with the recognition of striking contrasts in the documents. In the Gospels there is a remarkable difference of presentation in the Fourth from what we find in the first three.

¹ E. F. Scott, *The New Testament To-day*, p 5.

Two generations ago many critics were so much impressed by this that they discredited it as a historical document, and some even went so far as to speak of St. John's Gospel as a philosophical romance from the second half of the second century. Such extravagances only provoke ridicule to-day, but no student of the life of Jesus can ignore the special purpose and character of this Gospel, or use it in quite the same way for historical purposes that he would the Synoptics. In this country, at any rate, there is a pretty general agreement that in the Fourth Gospel we have a theological manifesto in the form of a record of the life of Jesus, based on the reminiscences of the Beloved Disciple, often correcting or supplementing the widely circulated Synoptic tradition, but generally viewing those far-off events through the glowing haze of reflection, and of meditation upon the deepest mysteries of fellowship with the Spirit of Christ. We recognise that allegory and history are strangely mingled in this story, and that throughout the Gospel the spiritual significance of any event is the reason for its introduction into the narrative. Those faithful disciples of the aged Apostle, who gathered round him in Ephesus and preserved this record of his teaching about Jesus, have given to the Church the supreme monument of early Christian faith and thought. For they show us that before the last of the apostles had passed from earth, it was seen that the facts of the earthly life of Jesus and the data of Christian experience must be related to the ever-changing needs of the human mind, and find fresh expression in the idiom of each new age.

Turning for a minute from the Gospels to the rest of the New Testament, modern criticism took its start from the evident discrepancy between the account of early Christianity in the Acts of the Apostles and the impressions given us in some of the letters of Paul. It was the great Tübingen scholar, Ferdinand Christian Baur, who gave an altogether new direction to the study of early Christian history more than ninety years ago by following up this clue. Unfortunately this most learned and stimulating historian was under the domination of the Hegelian philosophy, with its formula thesis—antithesis—synthesis. He thus discovered, as he thought, a key to unlock the true explanation of the development of the Catholic Church in the

New Testament itself. First came the Petrine party, the party of the original apostles, then the opposition party of Paulinists arose, and in due course a party of reconciliation, of which the Book of Acts is our earliest representative. As this reconciling movement made headway, the antagonistic parties gradually made concessions to each other, until at last early in the second century the pressure of the common enemy, Gnosticism, forced a union, and so the rival parties of Peter and Paul became one in the Catholic Church. Now this kind of criticism was far too theoretical and speculative, and Baur's theory is obsolete. But Baur himself did an immense service to the study of the New Testament by his contention that we must allow the books of the New Testament to speak for themselves. Instead of presupposing an ideal community in which every advance was made according to plan, with harmonious co-operation on the part of all the members, Paul's letters remind us that questions of policy sharply divided the primitive Church. It is not only the controversial note in Galatians and Corinthians that reminds us of this; there are incidental allusions right through his extant correspondence suggesting that the Acts of the Apostles tells us only a little of the amazing story of the growth and conflicts of the Apostolic Church. In other words, all the epistles are valuable historical documents. But to know their worth, and the limits within which their evidence is admissible, we must study them carefully, examining their language and style, their leading ideas and literary and doctrinal affinities, in order to discover, if possible, their date and authorship, and the true place they occupy in the life and growth of the Church. It is thus evident that literary and historical criticism are but two aspects of one method, and that the sole purpose in using this method is to get as near as we possibly can to the truth about the origin and early history of Christianity.

Let us now come back to the beginning again, and see what are some of the results of the 'higher criticism' (as it is called) of the Gospels.

We have already seen that the Fourth Gospel, supremely valuable as it is, stands in a different class from the Synoptic Gospels, upon which we depend chiefly for our knowledge of the course of the public ministry and the main substance of the

teaching of Jesus. But perhaps the most fruitful result of the criticism of the last generation is the determination of the way in which the Synoptic Gospels stand related to one another. It is now almost universally accepted that Mark is the original authority for the narrative of the life of Jesus, and that the writers of the first and third Gospels had it before them in almost exactly its present form. They were also in possession of a collection of the Sayings of Jesus, which they used in different ways, Luke weaving them into what seemed to be the appropriate historical context, whereas the first Evangelist brings them together in five large groups according to their subject matter. In addition to this common use of two main documents, we must probably allow for at least one special document in Luke, and both writers, though Luke more particularly, must have drawn freely from a rich store of oral tradition. The acceptance of this method of documentary analysis makes it impossible to quote indiscriminately from the Gospels and assume that any passage is unquestionably authentic. At first this sounds disturbing, and seems to imply that the Gospels are no longer the free and open possession of the plain man that they once were. It was so easy to go to those sacred books and take every word ascribed to Jesus as an actual saying that fell from those blessed lips. Well, it is still as true as ever it was that he who steeps himself in the teaching of the Gospels can discover the mind of Christ as well as (and perhaps for better than) the academic student who cannot see the wood for the trees. But there are some ways in which we can find positive gain from the new method of reading the Gospels. A careful comparison of parallel passages shows us that a certain tendency can be traced in a writer's treatment of his sources. Sometimes this brings relief from a serious perplexity; sometimes it puts one on his guard against a possible misunderstanding.

Two or three examples will make this clear.

(a) In the Gospel according to St. Matthew we are struck by the writer's keen interest in Old Testament sayings or incidents which seem in any way to bear some resemblance to the experiences of Jesus. 'That it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the prophet' runs like a refrain through the early

chapters, and very often it needs a good deal of ingenuity to discover any connection, to say nothing of fulfilment. In view of this well marked tendency, let us consider what Jesus really did say about the prophet Jonah. When some Scribes and Pharisees came to our Lord demanding a sign, he refused to gratify them, as Mark quite clearly tells us. But Jesus said more than this. Matthew and Luke, following their other source, which contained the Sayings of Jesus, show that He went on to say that the only sign which would be given to this evil and adulterous generation was the sign of the prophet Jonah. Now at this name the first Evangelist quickly saw his chance of bringing in a striking parallel from the Old Testament. Jonah spent three days and three nights in the whale's belly. Of course that prefigured the experience of Jesus in the sepulchre! I don't suppose any of us has felt quite happy about that alleged reply of Jesus. For one thing, that remarkable experience of the ancient prophet was not a sign to anyone but himself. But even more important is it for us to observe that Jesus never showed any interest in the thaumaturgic side of Old Testament story. Nothing is more impressive in Christ's attitude to the Old Testament than His infallible instinct for what was spiritual and of universal application in the sacred Scriptures of His people. We therefore turn to Luke, who also reports this saying, and find not a word about the episode of the whale. But we do find what Matthew also records, and what was evidently intended by Jesus as the sign of Jonah; it is 'The men of Nineveh shall rise up in the Judgment against this generation and shall condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and a greater than Jonah is here.' In other words, the only evidence which Jesus would bring forward in His own behalf was an appeal to the moral sense. His kingdom is of the spirit, and He would not coerce the moral judgment by any display of a power which belongs to another realm of values. How very much more like Jesus this reply is than the precarious analogy between that other part in the allegory of Jonah and the resurrection, which was still in the future, and was never to be a sign to the unbeliever, but was only a special confirmation of faith to those who already had the discernment of love.

(b) Everyone knows that one of the most perplexing problems of the Gospels is the question: How far did our Lord share in the expectation of His contemporaries that the end of the age was fast approaching? To what extent did He believe that He would soon return in majesty on the clouds of heaven and bring the present world order to a close in judgment and triumph? This is one of those questions which profoundly affect not only the theology, but also the ethics of the New Testament. The problem cannot be solved by any easy formula. When we have done our best to allow for every factor in the complex situation, there is still a wide margin of uncertainty. But here again Synoptic criticism does bring some relief. A systematic examination of our documents shows unmistakably a definite tendency to heighten the apocalyptic colouring of our Lord's words about the future at every stage of the tradition. Those who wish to see how far-reaching are the results of the scientific application of this method can do so by reading that striking work of Miss Lily Dougall and Mr. Cyril Emmet, *The Lord of Thought*.² One may feel that this book goes too far in the attempt to explain away the residuum of eschatological sayings, but the surgical treatment of the text is fully borne out by the soundest principles of documentary analysis. It is tempting to go on and find numerous other instances of the contribution which the criticism of the Gospels brings to our more perfect understanding of the mind of Jesus. But this would take more time than we can spare this afternoon. There is, however, another question which may be in the minds of some. How does the central Figure of the Founder of Christianity emerge from the critical examination of the documents? To others that question is impertinent, perhaps even profane. They would say of Jesus Christ, with far greater emphasis, what Matthew Arnold wrote of Shakespeare:

Others abide our question. Thou art free.
We ask and ask: Thou smilest and art still,
Out-topping knowledge. For the loftiest hill
That to the stars uncrowns his majesty,
Planting his steadfast footsteps in the sea,
Making the Heaven of Heavens his dwelling place,
Spare but the cloudy border of his base
To the foil'd searching of mortality.

² An earlier and most scientific treatment of this problem is that by Canon Streeter in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp 425 ff.

But it is surely a mistaken reverence which declines the challenge to show that the Christ of faith is one with the Jesus of history. It is the more unfortunate that the test should seem to be avoided, inasmuch as the suspicion is so utterly groundless. It may well be that some passages, such as the Infancy narratives, are recognised as being of inferior evidential value to the records of the ministry. We may come to regard some of the most beautiful stories in the Fourth Gospel as belonging to another class of literature than strictly historical narrative, though divinely true in their spiritual essence. But the outstanding fact is that in the earliest collection of Sayings, which we can trace behind Matthew and Luke, in that primitive Gospel of the ministry of Jesus which we call St. Mark, in the portions of Luke drawn from other sources, as well as in the freest interpretations of Matthew, it is the same Jesus whom we see. There He stands all the time in His perfect humanity, in His unique and incomparable moral authority, with His unfailing insight into the weaknesses and self-deception of our human hearts, with His consciousness of unbroken filial fellowship with God, with His power to bring health of body and healing of mind to the broken and the distracted, hope and cleansing to the outcast and the sinner.

There is, of course, a school of criticism, capricious and doctrinaire, which sees in the Gospels little evidence of the historic Jesus, but only witness to the ideas current and dominant in the Church at the close of the first century. That is the fundamental weakness of the contributions of Drs. Lake and Foakes Jackson in their monumental work, *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Some of you will remember how, at the Cambridge Conference of Modern Churchmen two years ago, Mr. Emmet described their presentation of the case as 'a view which suggests that, though Jesus existed, He did not really count.' He went on to urge that the fundamental criticism on this book is that it fails historically 'because it makes Jesus unimportant and uninteresting. Such a view explains neither the figure of Jesus as given us in the Gospels, nor the impact of Jesus on His age. When we study the Gospels from the point of view of historical criticism, whatever else we get, we get the impression of an overwhelming personality.'

In those words we are listening to a voice which represents the best type of New Testament criticism in this country. It is not too much to say that a critical examination shows that our faith has in history foundations that are both solid and firm.

When we turn to the rest of the New Testament our interest languishes. Yet it is a great mistake to undervalue the testimony of the Epistles. Paul toiled and wrote and died before our earliest Gospel was published to the world. His evidence of the Resurrection of our Lord takes us back to the first generation of Christian testimony. The story of his conversion gives us some measure by which to gauge the influence of the Spirit of Jesus and the faith of the Church of the first days. Few things in the history of modern criticism are more significant than the trend of opinion about the genuineness of the Pauline letters. Ferdinand Baur did great service nearly a century ago by vindicating the Pauline authorship of the four great evangelical epistles to the Galatians, the Corinthians and the Romans. Little by little the authenticity of the letters to the Philippians, the Thessalonians and the Colossians with Philemon have been conceded by the great majority of critics. That left only Ephesians and the Pastorals in dispute. Now quite recently we have two such radical scholars as Prof. B. W. Bacon, of Yale, and Prof. Lake, of Harvard, acknowledging that if Colossians is by Paul, there is no valid reason for denying his authorship of Ephesians.³ As for the Pastoral Epistles, one notices a growing tendency amongst those who cannot accept them in their present form as Paul's to recognize considerable Pauline elements in them.

In spite of the attacks still made upon the Lucan authorship of *Acts* in some schools of continental criticism, British scholarship defends the traditional view with very powerful arguments. Amongst the latest considerations in favour of its reliability is the cogent plea by Prof. Burkitt, of Cambridge, that as Luke can be shown to have made so substantially trustworthy a use of Mark's Gospel, it is reasonable to presume that he would be equally reliable in his use of other sources in the composition of *Acts*.⁴ The critical investigations of the last

³ Lake, *Landmarks of Early Christianity*, p. 122. Bacon, *Jesus and Paul*, 6. 135.

⁴ *Beginning of Christianity*, II, pp. 106 ff.

generation have helped to give the Acts a high place in historical literature. What we must also recognize is that Luke's sources were not all of equal value, and that in the early chapters we cannot be quite so certain that we have an exact transcript of events just as they occurred. The remaining writings of the New Testament are immensely valuable for the sidelights they throw on the inner life of the Church, and the data provided in them for the reconstruction of the history of Christianity in the last third of the first century. How exciting that study has become! In the pages of the New Testament we read first the story of the revelation that came in the life and teaching of One who rose high above the understanding of His own disciples. Then we trace the story of the various influences which compelled those disciples and their converts to explore the meaning and implications of their message to the world. We watch with breathless interest the course of that little ship with her precious freight, as she makes her way against wind and cross-currents, and narrowly escapes shipwreck on one rock after another, and sometimes is in peril of running aground on quicksands. Divided counsels imperil the navigation, and more than once the crew is at loggerheads. Yet she keeps on her way in spite of all her fightings without and fears within, and we begin to ask whether there is not an Unseen Hand on the helm. Indeed, that is always the result of doing full justice to the human element in the Bible. Our eyes are sure to be opened as in no other way to the presence of the divine. As that great, if very conservative, scholar, Bishop Westcott, used to say: 'Study the Bible as you would study any other book, and then you will come to see that it is unlike any other book.' The critical study of the literature of the early Church shows us that Christianity was not one simple, dogmatic system of truth from the beginning, but the truth was continually being disclosed to the society of believers in relation to some new need. The New Testament is one continuous apologetic, or re-statement, of the Christian message to a constantly changing constituency. Judaism, Stoicism, the mystery-religions, gnosticism, all leave their mark on the New Testament, but we make a great mistake if we allow our critical study of it to blind us to its distinctive message. We must not lose the essence of Christianity

in those contemporary influences which helped to shape its form and aid its growth. The New Testament is the record of a supreme revelation and of a victorious experience, and if our eyes are always kept open to that truth, we shall read it with spiritual sympathy, and scholarship will be the handmaid of piety. If the question is raised whether the work of the Church will be helped or hindered by the light which has been thrown on the New Testament, let me give the four-fold answer offered by Prof. E. F. Scott in his recent most admirable book, *The New Testament To-day*:

(a) 'Criticism, whatever else it has done, has enabled us to get behind legends and conjectures and lay hold of facts. Faith has found a real starting-point.'

(b) 'We can feel again, as men felt in the primitive age, that what Christ gave was not a creed or a system, but a regenerating spirit.'

(c) 'By recovering for us the historical life of Jesus, criticism has brought Christianity back to the true source of its power.'

(d) 'Last of all, the modern enquiry has delivered us from the thought of Christianity as simply a deposit of truth, and has helped us to think of it as a living revelation.'

SIN AND THE MODERN MIND

By the Rev. R. V. G. TASKER, B.A., formerly Scholar of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

MINISTERS of all denominations are deploring that there is little or no 'sense of sin' found amongst men and women of to-day. 'The higher man of to-day,' it has been said, 'is not worrying about his sins; his purpose is to be up and doing.' Rightly or wrongly, many people of our time, and by no means the most careless or irresponsible, do not see the necessity or the desirability of cultivating what Christianity has known in the past as a 'sense of sin.' That this is, on the whole, a true, and at the same time a regrettable fact, I think we should all agree; for, although it cannot be denied that the Church has often in the past meant by a 'sense of sin' something which we should to-day regard as crude, undesirable, and in some cases even mentally harmful,¹ it would appear that

¹ Cf. the case of John Bunyan described by James Bissett Pratt in *The Religious Consciousness*, p. 141.

without some 'sense of sin' there can be no real Christianity at all. It is my purpose in this paper to try and enquire into two of the causes which have led to this weakening of a 'sense of sin'; to estimate as sympathetically as possible their value; and to try and suggest a view of sin which does violence neither to the facts of human experience, nor to the teaching of modern sciences, nor to the Revelation contained in the New Testament. My hope is, that however inadequately or unsatisfactorily I may deal with such a large subject, I shall at any rate raise a sufficient number of points of interest to provide food for reflection.

There seem then to me to be two main causes which have tended to undermine any conception of a 'sense of sin.' The first is the wholly negative conclusion which has been drawn from the widespread—and, I should maintain—legitimate reaction from the doctrine of Original Sin. And the second is the false deductions which have been drawn in certain quarters from the popular and half-understood publications which deal with the truths of the New Psychology. It will be necessary to consider these two causes in somewhat greater detail.

It cannot be denied that the truth of the doctrine of Original Sin as it has been understood in the Church in the past, and by no means least in the Reformed Church, is challenged by the majority of thinking people of to-day. It will not stand the test either of scientific research or of Biblical criticism. Modern evolutionary science knows nothing of an alleged condition of original righteousness at the outset of human history, or of a catastrophic departure from it on the part of the oldest ancestor of the Human Race which was destined to affect the generations of man yet unborn. Rather it gives us a picture of a slow, gradual ascent on the part of man, from a purely animal stage to the more cultured and civilized being we know to-day.

The Science of Biblical criticism has, moreover, for many years now, ceased to regard the first chapter of *Genesis* as an historical account of man's origin; and it is from these chapters that the doctrine of Original Sin was drawn. From thence it passed into the mind of St. Paul, doubtless through the channel of Rabbinical thought, though to what extent the Jews of St. Paul's day held a doctrine of Original Sin caused by the

fall of Adam is a much debated point. *The Apocalypse of Baruch*—a document probably contemporary with St. Paul—for example, contains the fine sentence, ‘Adam is not the cause of sin save in his own soul. Each man is the Adam of his own soul.’

It is, however, difficult from a study of *Romans* v, uncertain though the exegesis of that chapter is, to evade the conclusion that St. Paul regarded Adam as in some sense the cause of subsequent human sin. It is, nevertheless, remarkable how little the teaching of *Romans* v, or for that matter the theology of St. Paul in general, seems to have influenced the Church after the close of the Apostolic Age. There seems a good deal to be said for Dr. Burkitt’s suggestion that ‘had it not been for the heretic Marcion, we might never have had the great Pauline Letters at all.’

Marcion was the first Christian of the second century who was really interested in St. Paul, and it was he who, in the interests of his own theology, probably made the first collection of Pauline Letters, which were subsequently to find a place in the New Testament. I mention this merely to show that there was such a thing in quite early days as a Christianity which knew little of St. Paul—a fact which is apt, to us, to seem almost impossible, so vitally is our conception of Christianity bound up with the teaching of the great apostle.

The doctrine of Original Sin then, even if it be granted that it is found in the *Epistle to the Romans*, was not part of the essential faith of the early Christians. It is given little emphasis in the Greek Fathers, and it was not till the days of Augustine that it set a mark, and an indelible mark, upon the theology of Christendom. Augustine’s theology was, of course, in many respects a crude reaction from his own past experience, and he found in *Romans* v a theology which supported his own experience of the helplessness and the depravity of unredeemed Human Nature. The result was that he came to identify Original Sin with human instincts, and particularly with the sex instinct, and this view of sin has, ever since, to a greater or less extent, tainted the teaching of the Christian Church. It is true that there were always protests against it right up to the Reformation from Christians who adopted the Semi-Pelagian posi-

tion, but it was always the official teaching of the Church, even if it was not always greatly emphasized. The Reformers, regarding the Bible as their sole authority, came to place an emphasis upon St. Paul which had never been placed upon him, and most of all was their emphasis laid upon the Epistle to the Romans, and particularly upon the fifth chapter. The doctrine of Original Sin taught by the Reformers was practically a doctrine of the total depravity of human nature unredeemed by the grace of Christ.

The point I wish to emphasize is that, while such a conception is seldom openly taught in our churches to-day, it does still—to a greater or less extent—hold a place in the formularies and services of our Church. The Ninth Article, for example, asserts that Original Sin is ‘the fault and corruption of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness; therefore, in every person born into the world it deserveth God’s wrath and damnation.’ No amount of mental gymnastics can get away from the fact that this Article teaches the Augustinian view of sin.

The same teaching underlies our Baptism Services, and the crude superstition which exists to-day among the uneducated about the perils of an unbaptized infant; and children in the Catechism are taught that they are born in sin, and are by nature the children of wrath. The language of our General Confession, although I know it is possible to interpret it otherwise, really breathes the same atmosphere with its insistence that there is no health in us. Few things seem to be of such supreme importance in the matter of Prayer Book revision as a drastic re-writing of the passages which are concerned with the question of sin. Not only do they give the impression of disregard of truth, but, what is more important to our present discussion, the very fact that the Church has not substituted a more satisfactory view of sin in their place has given the exaggerated impression that all that the Church teaches with regard to sin is out of date or untrue. We must then, I think, be sympathetic with the first of the two reasons which I have given above for a disappearance of the ‘Sense of Sin.’ We shall not, however, for reasons which we shall consider in a moment,

jump to the conclusion that the whole concept of sin is a delusion or that sin is merely a 'necessary adjunct to the Evolutionary process.' The denial of the Augustinian doctrine of Original Sin is by no means the same as a denial of the existence of sin.

I pass now to a consideration of the second reason which I stated above for the growing lack of a 'Sense of Sin,' namely, the exaggerated deductions which have been drawn from the teaching, or the supposed teaching, of the New Psychology. A cursory reading of the New Psychology seems in the minds of many to leave little place for any concept of sin. It seems to emphasize so strongly the extent to which we are influenced by the largely unconscious working of the great animal instincts of our nature. It seems to teach us that the repression of these instincts, and particularly of the sex instinct, is a practice doomed to result in grave mental disorder. It seems to teach us that the will is at best a very impotent factor in our general make-up; and altogether the general impression seems to be that much that Christianity has laid emphasis upon hitherto, and much that it has regarded as sinful, is really natural and inevitable. We seem to be such helpless creatures, swayed, whether we like it or not, by forces which do not appear to be wholly under our control. Such a reading of the New Psychology is of course one-sided, unsatisfactory and untrue. What I wish, however, to emphasize is that that kind of argument claiming to be a legitimate deduction from a modern science is very largely responsible for the growing lack of the 'sense of sin' to-day.

It seems necessary, then, to make an attempt—and it is most refreshing to find a few modern writers are making the attempt²—to re-state our view of sin on psychological lines. For, even if wrong deductions have been made from it, the New Psychology has much to teach us. It has shown us that the animal instincts of our nature are not to be regarded as sinful, because they supply the driving force for our noblest, as well as for our worst, actions. It has shown us that these instincts, unless adequately sublimated and harmonized by a

² Cf. *The Doctrine of Sin*, by Mr. R. S. Moxon, reviewed in the *Modern Churchman* for February, 1922.

great compelling ideal, will spend their energies along unnatural and abnormal channels. It has shown us the danger of the mental conflict which results from the repression of a great instinct made without the assent of the individual concerned. It has shown us the powerlessness of the will to achieve anything without the support of the energy derived from the instincts. Our only real quarrel with the psychologists is when they fail to take into account other equally vital factors of human experience, and when they describe man as though he were an animal, and nothing more than an animal. Man has something which no other animal has. He has personality. He has reason. He has a conscience. If he knows that he is influenced unconsciously by the great animal instincts of his being, he knows also that he has power to control, at any rate to some extent, the channels in which these instincts shall expend their energy. He is conscious of a sense of shame, and of disgust with himself when he has done certain things, which he feels quite sure he need not have done. Such an experience is almost universal, and it is upon this experience that our conception of sin must be based. Every man, even the most degraded, has some ideal for which he feels he ought to be striving, and when he acts in contrary to this ideal, he feels, however faintly, a 'sense of sin.' What, then, is sin? Sin is the wasting of the energy derived from our instincts in order to achieve ends which are incompatible with our highest ideal. We sin when we refuse to check the activities of our unconscious instincts by the exercise of our conscious reason. 'Each man,' says St. James in a passage that rings singularly true today, 'is tempted by his own lust' (*i.e.* by his primitive instincts demanding uncontrolled satisfaction), 'and lust having conceived' (*i.e.* having received the sanction of the conscious will) 'beareth sin, and sin when it is fully grown bringeth forth death.' And if we wish for a doctrine of Original Sin, we may say that it is the universal tendency in man to gratify the natural instincts of his being, and to use them for purely selfish ends, instead of in the service of a higher ideal. As Christians we believe that in Jesus Christ, Humanity has received the greatest human ideal—an ideal which is capable, and has shown itself to be capable, of harmonizing our instincts and using them in its

service. The newly-born babe is brought, by the Sacrament of Baptism, into the atmosphere of the society in which the Christ Ideal is, or should be manifestly embodied, so that its natural animal instincts may be controlled and harmonized by that ideal. In the service of Confirmation the child makes this ideal his own, and the morality of all his own subsequent actions is to be judged by this question: Are they, or are they not in accordance with this ideal? Such a view of sin does not minimize, but rather intensifies, the fact of sin, and yet it does not run counter to the real truths of the New Psychology.

The question remains. Is it in accordance with the Revelation contained in the New Testament? I maintain that it is. St. Paul, in an inspired utterance which bears no trace of his Rabbinical training, but which seems to suggest a universal truth, says towards the end of the Epistle to the Romans, 'Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.' This seems exactly to give the clue that we want. For we know that by 'faith' St. Paul meant, not a collection of doctrine which it was sin to disbelieve, but rather a personal love relationship with Jesus Christ; and actions are sinful just so far as they tend to violate that relationship. And this Christ Ideal had so impressed itself upon the mind of St. Paul and upon the minds of the New Testament Christians in general, that the idea of a Christian sinning after his conversion was to them almost inconceivable.

St. Paul's own moral conflict had been solved by his conversion. The old struggle of the will so vividly described in *Romans* vii was over. He had fallen in love with Jesus Christ, and all was now a joyous pressing on towards the goal of perfection. It was only under the cruel pressure of facts that the Church was eventually obliged to reckon with the phenomenon of sin in its members. Even as late as the *First Epistle of St. John* the writer still holds that a true Christian cannot really sin. 'Whosoever is born of God does not sin because His seed dwelleth in him. He cannot sin.' And it was because the early Christians felt so strongly the force of this Christ Ideal that they regarded the action of desertion from the Christian fold as such a terrible and unforgiveable offence. 'It is impossible,' says the writer of the *Hebrews*, 'to renew again unto repentance those who have tasted of the gift of God and have then

fallen away.' Like Esau, they have sold their birthright by crucifying to themselves the Son of God afresh. Similarly the writer of the second *Epistle of St. Peter*, in a not wholly edifying passage, says, 'It were better for them not to have known the Way of Truth than, having known it, to turn back from the commandments delivered unto them.' The last stage is worse than the first. It has happened unto them in accordance with the truth of the proverb, 'The dog has returned to his own vomit, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.' And it was because the early Christians felt the power of this new Christ ideal which had come into their lives so strongly, that they could not understand why it was that the Jews had not accepted it when they saw it blazoned forth in the glory of the earthly life of Jesus. And so we find that the Fourth Evangelist lays tremendous emphasis throughout his Gospel on the sin of Judaism in the rejection of Christ. The light was in the world, and they chose the darkness rather than the light. If Christ had not come they would not have had sin; but now they had no excuse for their sin. Nearly every time sin is mentioned in the Fourth Gospel it is in connection with the wilful blindness of the Jews who refuse to see the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

The Christian, then, is one who is in love with Jesus Christ. And sin for a Christian is every action done or left undone which tends to weaken or violate that love relationship. The Prodigal Son was a sinner, not because he was born in sin, nor because he inherited a depraved nature, nor because he violated a rule of conduct external to himself, but because he deliberately cut himself off from a love relationship and because he allowed himself to be ruled by his own unconscious animal instincts. It was only when 'he came to himself' and realized that he had been acting contrary to the best ideal which he knew that he experienced a 'sense of sin' which led to penitence and forgiveness. 'Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.' It is upon the line of thought suggested by this text that I think we shall find a restatement of the nature of sin which will violate neither the facts of our personal experience nor the dictates of our reason.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE WRONG AND THE RIGHT WAY.*

Mr. Harrison's book is a good example of a type of apologetic which has recently come into vogue. On p. 72 we read:

"Modern thought" touches a mere fringe of the so-called educated classes. Of these, not one in a thousand who prefer Sunday golf to church is repelled from the latter by intellectual difficulties about the "supernatural element" in the Creed. If the truth were known, it is probably the absence of the supernatural element in the *public worship* of the Church which is responsible for his lack of interest, for it is a well-established fact that where it prevails the churches are not only well-attended, but often crowded. It is also well known that in what is called "Society," strange cults . . . are extremely popular, astrologers and fortune-tellers flourish, and the gap left by the abolition of relics of the saints in church has been filled by mascots on motor-cars. The intellectual difficulties are felt for the most part by the uneducated, or, rather, self-educated classes; the intelligent artisan, whose mental pabulum is derived from the second-hand bookstalls, which reflect the ideas of a past generation of thinkers.'

The above passage is characteristic of a good deal of recent apologetic literature. It contends that the contemporary indifference to the claims and message of the Church is due not to reasonable intellectual difficulties, but to indolence, ignorance, levity, and even to superstition; and where 'honest doubt' does exist, it is due to some preoccupation with Victorian ideas which are now obsolete.

It naturally follows, if these contentions be true, that the task of the apologist is an easy one—easy, that is to say, so far as giving reasons is concerned; though no one can guarantee, in the prevailing ineptitude of the public mind, that they will be listened to.

Though we willingly admit that there may be a good deal of truth in Mr. Harrison's estimates, yet we cannot but feel that he is too optimistic in attributing current unbelief and scepticism so entirely to mental indolence, or to obsession with Victorian materialism. He seems to us to overlook several facts. In the first place, several popular prophets, who would not thank you for calling them Victorian, such as Mr. Wells, Mr. Bernard Shaw and Mr. Arnold Bennett, do little to strengthen, but much to diminish, the prestige of the Churches. We ourselves are far from regarding the authority of these writers as final in theological, philosophical, or scientific subjects. Yet, at the same time, it cannot be contended that the large numbers of the public who, somewhat uncritically perhaps, absorb their ideas, are altogether unintelligent, or mentally indolent, or superstitious. These writers may or may not be sincere themselves, but they have a large number of sincere disciples, who, we venture to think, deserve treating seriously by orthodox apologists. It is little use to begin by belittling their intelligence, for, after all, it needs no great perspicacity to see the point of certain quite sound arguments.

* *The Creed for the Twentieth Century*, by C. G. Harrison. Pp. xv+128. Longmans (1923), 4s. 6d. net.

Stones of Stumbling, by A. I. Tillyard. Pp. xiv+218. Heffer & Sons (1921), 9s. net.

Then, in the second place, the type of apologetic exemplified by Mr. Harrison does nothing to dispel the notion that the ecclesiastical authorities do not treat the public quite sincerely where certain matters of literary and historical criticism are concerned. The suspicion prevails that certain views are condemned, not so much because they are untenable as because they are unorthodox. So much vituperation, and so little reasonable argument, so many appeals to authority and so few to the results of scholarship, create the impression that the champions of orthodoxy feel themselves rather hard-pressed; and where there is so much protestation, one suspects that there may be some degree of uneasiness. 'If these people were so sure about the truth as they say they are,' thinks the ordinary man, 'they would not create such a disturbance.'

We are far from believing that the production of a sound orthodox apologetic is an easy matter; but what we feel is that Mr. Harrison goes the wrong way about it—at least his method seriously limits the utility of his work.

A more generally useful piece of work we believe to be Mr. A. I. Tillyard's *Stones of Stumbling*, which is the sequel to a similar book, published some years ago and called *The Manuscripts of God*. In the earlier volume he sought to present Christianity as the perfection of natural religion. This may not seem very satisfactory to those who are obsessed with the unfortunate Thomist dichotomy between natural and supernatural; but this species of argument is both legitimate and sound, and is likely to carry weight with the modern man who does any thinking at all; for it is a profound mistake to imagine, as so many hasty writers appear to do, that recent results in the physical, biological, or psychological sciences rehabilitate the old opposition between natural and supernatural.

Mr. Tillyard's method in his later volume may not seem satisfactory to those who must have

'A clear account writ fair and broad
And a plain apologie,'

i.e. must start with a definite and systematic framework of revealed dogma, solving all difficulties and answering all questions. His method may be illustrated by two passages:

'Those who live and obey do not find their intellectual perplexities solved or all their difficulties dispelled, but they can bid their doubts remove and stand aside. Here they are content to know in part and to wait for such fuller light as may hereafter be vouchsafed them. Such is the Christian idea of growing up. It is spiritual development, and the rest and certainty which come therewith' (p. 158).

And again (p. 215):

'Theology . . . finds its place but it is at the termination and not at the beginning of the way . . . It is no light task to take the Christian religion and turn it completely round, but this we have tried to do . . . Christ made goodness the chief thing: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of Heaven and its righteousness." Goodness leads to truth, and truth is valuable as it leads to goodness. If the accent can be placed on goodness, as it is in the Gospels . . . Christianity may be shown afresh to meet the deepest needs of man, and the highway be opened to Christian unity.'

It is true that this type of apologetic is not primarily intellectual. It will not satisfy those whose attitude is primarily intellectualist, who place

dogma first and make goodness and spiritual experience derivative. Still, it may help those who, if they are tired of negations, are also weary of dogmatic statements about things which are incapable of dogmatic formulation. After all it was a greater than Athanasius who wrote, 'Now we see, as in a mirror, darkly.'

J.C.H.

A DISCIPLE OF MODERNISM.*

The preface tells us that this book is written for the 'average man,' who (the author believes) is in more danger of superstition than of atheism.

'In his misty-mindedness he stands in manifest danger of being exploited by one or other of the many cults and religious movements which have sprung up like weeds all the world over, not least in South Africa. Some of them are of the most irrational and dangerously emotional kind.'

Hence, strange as it may seem, 'the Christian Church, if she knows her business, will have again to be the guardian and champion of rationality in faith in the face of irrationality in "religion."'

The Bishop, not unnaturally perhaps, wonders 'whether she does know her business.' 'Is she ready boldly to present the faith to those who, under modern conditions, are willing to think about it'? And he passes the remark that the Church in South Africa 'is not nearly so well developed as a teaching Church as she is as the organizer of institutional religion. She is well developed on the side of the ministry of the Sacraments. She needs reinforcement in the ministry of the Word.' Nor does this observation apply only to the Church in South Africa.

The Bishop, in expounding these remarks, actually uses words which might entitle the Traditionalist reader to believe the worst:

'The Church must claim the discriminating inspiration of the Holy Spirit that she may re-interpret the revelation of which she is the trustee. This involves risks, but they are life-giving risks. To refuse to take them means suicide.'

So far as the Old Testament is concerned our author is trenchantly liberal (p. 19):

'Nothing can avail here but a radical and ruthless revision of beliefs or semi-beliefs about the Old Testament. Minds must be swept clear of deposited lumber . . .

'In the place of the dogma of inspired writings, there must be substituted the recognition of inspired men. God never wrote a book. No book was ever inspired. He wrote upon the hearts and minds and consciences of living men.'

Nor does the Bishop hesitate to say that modern scholarship, besides saving the Old Testament from being a closed book, 'is doing a like work for the New Testament' (p. 38). And it is proving to be 'the means whereby the personality of the Founder of Christianity lives again in its pristine vividness and force.'

The earnest inquirer, therefore, must 'make no more assumptions about Him,' but 'follow with those who responded to His call, and see what comes of it.' And then there follows a notable pronouncement (p. 20):

'To say, at the very start, that "here is the virgin-born Incarnate Son of God" is to beg great questions. That implies a clear and untroubled understanding of what is meant by God.'

* *The Returning Tide of Faith*, by Neville S. Talbot, D.D., M.C. Pp. xii + 201. Nisbet & Co. (1923), 5s. net.

It implies, too, we might add, a clear understanding of what is meant by Man. This is indeed recognized elsewhere; on p. 24 we read:

'The term man, it is being recognized, is nothing fixed nor absolutely determined. For man, in common with the whole of Nature, is still in the making, is . . . the central figure in an order which allows of change, transformation, and new possibility.'

Bishop Talbot's philosophy of the Incarnation may legitimately be described as Modernist: 'The main truth of Christianity,' he writes, (p. 86)—the very essence of the Incarnation—'is something deeper than that Christ is God. It is—God is Christ. The first question—the bottom question—is not about Christ, but about God. That is the question which was asked and answered in the whole fact of Christ. *The truth of the Incarnation does not mean, nor ever has meant, the deifying of a man.* It is not the piling of attributes of deity on to Jesus Christ, as though those attributes were fully and sufficiently known apart from Christ. Rather it is the manifestation of what God is in terms of a human life. It is the revelation of the Father in His Son.

'If men ask, "What is God? What is He doing? Where is His love?" the answer is, "Jesus Christ; that is what God is and ever has been; that is what He is doing; that is His love."'

With regard to the *mode* of the Incarnation, the Bishop, while he declares (p. 180) that 'It is too much to say that conviction about the (Virgin) birth is absolutely necessary for a Christian,' and even italicises the remark, '*It is too much to say that we believe in Christ because He was virgin-born,*' yet he clings, not, as we think, for the best of reasons, to the traditional view. Here for a moment the ecclesiastic gets the better of the man, and we read with mixed feelings the following (p. 181):

'Most men know in their hearts that there is need of penitence as regards any man's love for a true woman . . .

'Something very vital is lost if the initiative in the birth of Jesus was but a husband's love for his wife.'

There is a taint of Augustinian Manicheism here. Still, if this declension from rationality (which is the only one of its kind) will do anything to recommend this reasonable book to Traditionalists, it is perhaps not to be regretted. For the book should be of real use to them, if only they can be persuaded to read it.

J.C.H.

A JOURNALISTIC LIFE OF CHRIST.*

This is not a review but an impression.

Some words from the book itself shall furnish a text. 'If there be but the hand to kindle it, a fire may flame forth at any time. A David always finds his Ghibborim, an Agamemnon his Heroes, an Arthur his Knights, a Charlemagne his Paladins, a Napoleon his Marshalls. And among the common people of Galilee Jesus found His first Apostles.' Proportionately Papini has fanned the dying fire of Italian religion. He is the religious counterpart of Mussolini, Papini is not satisfied with constitutional methods in exceptional times. You are his slave or his enemy. '*Sois mon frère ou je vous tue.*' To understand this it is necessary to remember the *dossier* of Papini. He was not always thus. Once he was anti-Christian in the anti-clerical sense of the Continent. He is a journalist

* *The Story of Christ*, by Giovanni Papini, translated by Mary Prichard Agnetti. Hodder & Stoughton, 10s. 6d. net.

and a propagandist who has been for or against Positivism, Idealism, Pragmatism, Futurism during the last twenty years. Then he discovered the Bible Madame Agnetti tells us in her all too short Preface. The possible effect of his discovery upon the right mind will not really astonish anyone familiar with the facts of religious education in Southern Europe. In the Bible Papini found the truth which none of the 'movements' of the age could give him. He is now resting there and this book is one of the effects of his new found peace. 'The fervour of the neophyte, the erudition of the man of letters, the firm conviction of the thinker, the intense gratitude of one who has been rescued from despair, and the loving devotion of one whose eyes have been opened to the immensity of the price paid for man's redemption, all breathe from the pages of this remarkable book, wherein the figure of Christ dominates, at once loving and austere, stern and tender, perfectly divine and perfectly human—a true man, a very God' (p. vii).

Consequently we are on the alert for a Life of Christ different from the saccharine unrealities with which we are all too familiar in this country. Papini belongs to that rare and limited order of writers of Lives of Christ of whom the author of *Ecce Homo* was one and Renan another. Is it mere coincidence that he and they were laity? The book is a work of Art—Italian Art. Intuitive rather than critical truth infuses it from cover to cover. Papini refracts some of that fresh light which the Puritan thinker said God would break forth from His Word. He has answered the call of those like the author of *If Winter Comes* for help and light in the prevailing darkness of our modern spiritual bankruptcy. Judging from the phenomenal success of the book in Europe and America (there is a current rumour that an Italian millionaire has ordered a copy to be sent to every inmate of the prisons of his own country) the cynical judgment, repeated *ad nauseam* that this age is especially indifferent in spiritual issues, is discredited. Cynics abound in the soil which produces formalists. Neither will care for this book. It positively hits the reader in the face with all the unabashed vitality of lands where Christians pass most of their lives out of doors. It is disturbing to the sober deportment of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, which reflects life as spent in little rooms, and well arranged to boot. Again it is significant that Papini is a Roman Catholic who has some hard things to say of Protestants. But we shall overlook that for the book's sake.

A. T. WOODMAN DOWDING.

CHRIST'S CHALLENGE TO YOUTH.*

In his most recent book Dr. Herbert Gray has given us a discussion of sex questions from the Christian point of view. No subject stands in more urgent need of right handling, and we know no writer who is better qualified to undertake the task. Courage, sympathy, faith, humour, an eye for essentials, and, above all, a worthy conception of God—all these are required in one who is to deal adequately with so complex a theme, and judged by this exacting criterion Dr. Gray stands the test. Many writers before him have lamented the cruel conspiracy of silence which long prevented the frank and open discussion of sex problems, but none, as far as we know, have hitherto taken the courageous and alto-

* *Men, Women, and God.* By the Rev. A. HERBERT GRAY, D.D. S.C.M. 1923. Pp. 200. Price 4/- and 3/-.

Work, Play, and the Gospel. By MALCOLM SPENCER, M.A. S.C.M. 1923. Pp. 144. Price 4/- and 2/6.

gether commendable step of writing a book intended avowedly for both sexes. In spirit and atmosphere *Men, Women and God* need not fear comparison with *Virginibus Puerisque*, but whereas Stevenson is content merely to charm, and is never more than half serious, Dr. Gray is more earnest in tone, and leaves no doubt in the reader's mind of his desire to help and to encourage, not merely to entertain. The book is presented to men and women alike because of the writer's conviction that 'until men and women understand and help each other there is going to be no happy solution of the problem of sex.' The spirit of that central conviction pervades the whole book, and gives it an honesty of thought and a beauty of expression for which we can scarcely be too grateful.

For the benefit of both sexes Dr. Gray repeats in effect the dictum of Amiel; 'Let us humbly accept from God even our own nature.' But 'nature' here is the equivalent not merely of the physical alone; it includes mental and spiritual as well. No relationship based solely on physical attraction can bring permanent satisfaction, inasmuch as it ignores the essential unity of man, flouting the just claims of mind and spirit to their due share in the intimacies of love.

While far from endorsing *Punch's* famous and cynical advice to those about to marry, our author admits frankly that 'two lifeless and stupid people can make of life something duller than either could make alone.' And he has some trenchant counsel to offer alike to the husband who tells you airily that household details are 'bally nonsense, or something equally picturesque,' and to those wives 'whose domestic possessions seem to constitute mere extensions of their nervous systems,' and who allow the tyranny of petty cares to stifle all wider interests.

In the matter of divorce, Dr. Gray believes it inadvisable to seek to enforce the Christian standard by law. In the realm of the highest Christian duties law has no jurisdiction; you cannot, for instance, compel a man to love his enemies by threat of legal penalties. Nor does it seem clear that the spirit of Christ forbids the re-marriage of divorced persons in all cases. The vexed question of birth control is dealt with in a manner no less courageous. Where the practice is the outcome of a selfish unwillingness to face hardship and to accept responsibilities, it must be condemned root and branch by all healthy-minded persons. That is clear enough. On the other hand for many homes large families may for one reason or another be inadvisable, if not positively wrong. In such circumstances, is the practice of birth control to be condemned? To this question Dr. Gray returns an emphatic No, taking his stand with those 'who believe that sexual intimacy is right and good in itself as an expression of affection.'

About the problem of compulsory celibacy Dr. Gray writes with sympathy and sound sense. Where the psychologist speaks of the sublimation of the sex instinct, he will rather urge the sufficiency of God. Religion is necessary for the right solution of each single problem as it arises; how much more for the adequate interpretation of the sum of all problems to which we give the name of Life! Towards the solution of the specific problem with which it deals we believe that this book will make a worthy contribution.

Like Dr. Gray, Mr. Malcolm Spencer is concerned with the needs and aspirations of young men and women. His aim is the relation of Christianity to the ordinary life of ordinary people. He seeks to re-state the essential truth of the Christian Gospel in terms which youth can understand and appreciate. The book might be named not inappropriately 'An

Apology for the Once Born.' As a student of educational theory Mr. Spencer is aware that you must not seek to force the mind of a child into channels of experience for which it is as yet unprepared. The child is not an adult in miniature but a child, and it ought to be treated as such. There is need, then, in religion for 'the educational approach.' The child, the adolescent, the grown man or woman—each must be approached from the angle of his natural interests, 'for the Gospel is the crown and fulfilment of the natural life and not its jealous rival.'

The pleasure-loving temper of our age, if it is to be rightly judged, must be considered against the sombre background of the late war. Its intolerance of restraint, its scant respect for traditional standards, its frank awareness of the mistakes and shortcomings of its predecessors—all this is less matter for querulous complaint than for sympathetic observation. Mr. Spencer refuses even to be dismayed by the modern disavowal of the Church's leadership. He desires to formulate a Christian ideal both of work and of play, of such a kind as to bring the fundamental ideas of Christianity into touch with the common problems and interests of work-a-day folk. He would have youth play itself into the Kingdom of God; he would translate the ideal of human brotherhood into terms of play, by making good games universally possible in every rank of society; he would have the Church dissociate itself altogether from a view of life which regards games and the drama as at best negatively harmless and at worst frivolous distractions from the serious business of the Christian life; he would have us see all life as a sacrament, and the hunger for beauty as the cry of an age condemned to the horrors of industrial ugliness for a God in whom beauty no less than truth and goodness finds its home.

W. M. P.

TWO BOOKS ON PHILOSOPHY.*

These two books differ considerably, both in scope and in method. The one comprises a series of philosophic *causeries*, the other is a systematic attempt to analyse the meaning, and trace the history, of a single philosophic idea—the idea of God. Needless to say, the former will appeal more to the general reader, especially as it is written with brevity, lucidity, and humour; and introduces those biographical details which, by making philosophers interesting, induce us to take some notice of their theories. To learn that philosophers were, and are, human, somehow makes philosophy seem more humane. Even Schopenhauer was no exception:

'In hours of depression he was inclined to regard all pleasures as worthless, but it does not appear that he attempted to put his pessimism into practice. On the contrary, in his last years, when that recognition came for which he had so longed, and which his works so richly deserved, he went every day to dine at an officers' mess in Frankfort, because there he got a good dinner at a reasonable price.'

Professor Beckwith's work, though less entertaining, is a valuable piece of apologetic for the Christian conception of God. He aims 'at such a presentation of the idea of God as will enable it to function anew in the life of to-day.'

One point that strikes us as of particular interest is his approach to the idea of the personality of God (pp. 269 f). He suggests that 'the notion

* *Short Talks upon Philosophy*, by Sir H. H. Cunynghame, K.C.B., M.A. Pp. 245. Constable (1923), 8s. 6d. net.

The Idea of God, by C. A. Beckwith. Pp. xiii+343. Macmillan (1923). 10s. 6d. net.

and degree of personality are determined by the number and quality of ends which are connected with it. . . A larger number and a higher grade of ends are involved in animal than in vegetable existences. Yet among animals there are none which have purposive ends either high enough or numerous enough to make life personal . . . It is only when we rise to man that we discover ends of such a character that we designate the one in whom these appear as personal. Even here they exist in manifold variety . . .

If evidence of purposive activity can be found in the universe, this purposive activity defines the nature of God as a *personal* nature. Moreover, this purposive activity must be qualified by the nature of its aims, which aims include, and even find their consummation in, moral and religious values. And as these are never complete, but are susceptible of indefinite expression, 'they witness to an inexhaustible push in the Will that called them into being.' The personal nature of God can be discovered in His purposes.

It is refreshing to find that Professor Beckwith does not follow the contemporary vogue of talking about unconscious purpose, or non-personal will, and so forth—all of which are hybrid, and even self-contradictory, terms. As Professor Ward has said, the universe is either teleological or mechanical; it is not likely to be a mixture of both. The present taste for 'blind and unconscious will' has arisen from ill-thought-out theories of biological evolution, and from a pious hope that so long as a purpose is not *personal* it will not scandalize the student of natural science, and will perhaps satisfy the theologian. Yet these biological conceptions, even though Schopenhauer formerly, and M. Bergson to-day, have lent their prestige to them, are likely to have a short life as means of interpreting the universe. They satisfy nobody, and are open to the objections to which all mechanistic theories are exposed, without being any safer from the criticisms which a genuine teleology must meet.

J.C.H.

CORRESPONDENCE

CONTRADICTORY DOGMA.

A LAYMAN'S COMPLAINT.

To the Editor of the MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

I walked home from the burial of a mutual friend with a Priest of the Anglican Church. We both agreed that our Order for the Burial of the Dead was a solemn and beautiful Office. Where the Priest partially disagreed with me was in my contention that the contradictory doctrines concerning the Resurrection, as given us in that Service, are most confusing and should be revised. The Priest admitted the contradictions but feared that any revision of the Service might lead to a dangerous division in our Church. To my mind, this fear of proclaiming the Truth is one of the weakest joints in the armour of our Faith.

Since then the Second Report of the Prayer Book Revision Committee of the National Assembly of the Church of England has made its appearance. While welcoming the alterations and additions recommended, one can but regret that, in some instances, the deletions have not been more drastic.

This subject: 'The Resurrection of the Dead,' is one that, more than ever in the last decade, has been of absorbing interest to peoples of all persuasions and Creeds. I am a very ordinary layman and my opinion is only of value as such, but I know that I am by no means alone in appreciating the difficulties that puzzle many zealous Churchmen as regards: Article IV, The Athanasian Creed, the contradictory and confusing sentences in the Order for the Burial of the Dead and certain phrases in the hymns we sing during that Service.

The following may be taken as examples of these contradictions and difficulties:

(a) Article IV distinctly states that 'Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His Body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature: wherewith He ascended into Heaven and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the Last Day.'

(b) The Athanasian Creed tells us that 'All men shall rise again with their bodies.'

(c) In the Order for the Burial of the Dead we begin by quoting Job, who maintained that 'though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.'

Then comes a quotation from the First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to Timothy, in which he tells us that 'it is certain we carry nothing out of this world' into the next.

Then we have Psalm xxxix in which David (?), in one of his pessimistic, Omar-like moods, cries out: 'O spare me a little that I may recover my strength: before I go hence, and be no more seen.'

Following on that, we come—*multa gratia Deo*,—to the Lesson from I Corinthians, xv, in which St. Paul, speaking with great authority, declares those men to be fools who think that we shall rise with our terrestrial bodies. He makes it very clear that we shall rise, not with an earthly natural body, but, with an incorruptible Spiritual Body. Most certainly does he state that 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God.' The dead shall be raised, he tells us, but raised changed and incorruptible, not with the flesh we have on earth, but with an incorruptible Spiritual Body.

After the wise sayings of St. Paul come certain Prayers. In the first of these it distinctly states that: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ shall *change* our vile body that it may be like unto His Glorious Body.' In the second we are told that 'The souls of the Faithful after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, *are* (not 'will be') in joy and felicity.' In the first part of the third prayer we are assured that 'whosoever believeth, shall live, though he die'; but in the latter part of the same prayer we express a hope that we may *rest* in Him, and that at the general Resurrection in the Last Day, may be found acceptable in God's sight.

The Collect for the first Sunday in Advent is in agreement with the latter part of this third prayer, for in that a prayer is offered up 'that in the Last Day . . . we may rise to the Life Immortal.' This seems to infer, as do other sentences in the Prayer Book and Hymn Books, that souls and bodies are 'sleeping' and 'resting' in the grave till then!

One wonders if the compilers of this last Collect really thought that the souls of just men made perfect were *sleeping* till the Last Trump? A long sleep and a seemingly useless one for many Saints of old. A far longer sleep, extending to thousands, aye, and to millions of years, for those good men among our Palaeolithic and Pliocene Ancestors. There

must have been some good fathers and mothers, some good sons and daughters, among those Neanderthal and Piltdown forbears of ours; why not? In the days, however, when this Collect was compiled 'by ye wytte of man,' Learned Divines honestly believed that God produced man in the Garden of Eden, as recently as B.C. 4004, in much the same way that a conjurer produces a rabbit in A.D. 1922! The Wonders of Creation as shown to us by Astronomical, Geological, Psychological and Physiological Revelation were unknown to them.

(d) How contradictory and confusing are some of the Hymns we sing in the Service for the Burial of the Dead, is a by-word to many thoughtful people.

Take the Book of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*:

In Hymn number 401, we sing that our departed brother is 'now upon the further shore,' while a few verses later on set forth that we are
'Leaving him to sleep in trust
Till the Resurrection Day.'

In Hymn number 402, we read, regarding the 'dead' child:

'In a world of pain and care,
Lord, Thou would'st no longer leave it;
To Thy meadows bright and fair
Lovingly Thou *dost* receive it;
Clothed in robes of spotless white
Now it dwells with Thee in Light.'

In Hymn number 428, we read, in one verse:

'The Saints of God! Life's voyage o'er,
Safe landed on that blissful shore.'

but in the very next, we are told:

'The Saints of God their vigil keep
While yet their mortal bodies sleep,
Till from the dust they too shall rise
And soar triumphant to the skies.'

That beautiful Book, *The English Hymnal* is much more in accordance with the teaching of St. Paul and the thoughts of spiritual Churchmen. Some of the Hymns for 'The Departed' are very beautiful. As an example, two verses of hymn number 357 may be taken:

'May we behold across the bar
Our dear Immortals as they are,
Empowered in act and will,
With purer eyes to see their King,
With fuller hearts His praise to sing,
With strength to help us still;
Not fettered now by fleshly bond,
But tireless in The Great Beyond,
And growing day by day.
Can we not make their gladness ours,
And share their thoughts, their added powers,
And follow as we pray?'

As regards (a), Article IV of our Faith: There is nowadays an ever increasing number of thoughtful and learned Churchmen who do not believe that Our Lord rose from the dead with His earthly, fleshly body, or that He ascended into Heaven 'with flesh, bones and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature.' They hold with the wisdom of St. Paul rather than with the wit of 'the Archbishops and Bishops of

both Provinces' of the Church of England in the sixteenth century. They believe that Our Saviour rose from the dead with His Glorious Spiritual Body, the 'like of which,' please God, we shall obtain hereafter.

But few thoughtful Churchmen now believe that our own earthly, fleshly body is resurrected. God forbid! We know St. Paul did not believe this. What many believe is: that we shall rise again to the next Life with a Spiritual Body, the essence of which is with us now. A Body *like* our earthly body, recognisable as our ego. A body that, as we shall be 'growing day by day in the Great Beyond,' will become more and more 'like unto His Glorious Body.'

As regards (b) The Athanasian Creed: It is an undeniable fact that the large majority of devout Churchmen in these days are, as regards the 'Damnatory Clauses' in this Creed, dogmatically speaking, 'Heretics.' They never repeat those clauses because they consider them to be damnatory clauses. Were we living in the days and in the country of that earnest but bloodthirsty Dominican, Don Domingo de Guzman, such men would probably provide fuel for the flames; *Laus Deo* we are not. Those who have lived many years in the East and studied with interest the other Religions that God has permitted to be evolved on earth, know full well the Truth that lies at the bottom of both the Hindu and Buddhist Faiths, so akin to ours in *their original purity*. It seems sacrilege to think that the God of Love will damn eternally good men and true because they do not know of or do not hold with the 'Catholic Faith' as laid down, *not* by Our Lord but by wrangling Bishops and Priests in the Fourth Century.

As regard (c) and (d), The Order for the Burial of the Dead and the *Hymns, Ancient and Modern*, connected therewith: These, as shown above, are full of weird inconsistencies in statements, prayer, and praise, which are mostly chimerical and wholly confusing. Well might one exclaim:

'Was there ever such a mass of contradictions?'

Many Priests and many Laymen are inclined to hold with the inspired and spiritual Apostle, St. Paul, rather than with these confusing conundrums devised by the wit of man.

Such Dogmatic Inexactitudes in the Foundation of any Corporate Body are fatal to its welfare. In the case of The Church, they are disastrously so. There is but one obvious remedy: Drastic Revision of the XXXIX Articles and The Book of Common Prayer. F. C. CARTER.

BOOKS FOR PARENTS AND CHILDREN.

As we often receive communications asking us to recommend books which may be used in giving religious instruction to the young, we venture to draw attention to the following list of books drawn up for that purpose by the Christian Evidence Society which is doing good work in this and in other directions. We should be glad if our readers would supplement this list from their own experience, giving the title, author's name, publisher's name, and price, of the volume recommended.

FOR PARENTS AND TEACHERS.

The Religious Difficulties of Children. E. E. R. Mumford. (Longmans.)

An Imaginative Child. A. A. Hilton. (Allenson, 1/6.)

Genesis (Bible for the Young Series). J. Paterson Smyth. (Sampson Low, 1/6 and 2/-.)

- Prophets and Kings* (Bible for the Young Series). J. Paterson Smyth. (Sampson Low, 1/6 and 2/-.)
One Volume Commentary. Peake. (Nelson, 12/6.)
God's Progressive Revelation of Himself. Wilson. (S.P.C.K.)
Four Lectures to Men on the Old Testament. Wilson. (S.P.C.K.)
The Old Testament and its Contents. Robertson (Exeter). (Black, 1/-; Guild Text Books.)
How we got our Bible. J. Paterson Smyth. (R.T.S., 2/6.)
The Divine Library of the Old Testament. Kirkpatrick. (Macmillan, 2/- and 4/-.)
Christ's Thought of God. Wilson. (Macmillan, 5/-.)
Religion and Science. By Seven Men of Science.
Old Testament. Dr. Fry.
The Bible. W. H. Frere. (Jackson, Leeds, 1½d.)

FOR PARENTS.

- The Dawn of Character*. E. E. R. Mumford. (Longman's, 5/-.)
The Training of the Twig. Rev. C. L. Drawbridge. Longman's, 1/-.)
The Dawn of Religion in the Mind of the Child. E. E. R. Mumford. (Longmans, 2/6.)
Training of the Child (People's Book Series). G. Spiller. (Nelson, 1/-.)
The Bible and Criticism (People's Book Series). Bennet and Adeney. (Nelson, 1/-.)

FOR CHILDREN.

- The Prince of Peace*. Macy. (Longmans, 6/-.)
Children's Prayers. Macy. (Longmans, 3/6.)
Morning Ray. Warron. (S.P.C.K.)
Good Shepherd. Warron. (National Society, 2/-.)
Our Wonderful Bible. Gertrude Hollis. (S.P.C.K., 2/-.)

ED. M.C.

THE AMERICAN HERESY HUNT.

As an article entitled 'The American Heresy Hunt,' which appeared in the *Modern Churchman* for March, seems to have given rise to some misconception in American ecclesiastical circles, we desire to state that :

- (1) The Editor is entirely responsible for the article.
- (2) No American clergyman of any denomination communicated with the Editor about the heresy charge before the publication of the article.
- (3) Every statement made by the Editor in the article had already appeared uncontradicted in the American Press.
- (4) The fourth reason given for Bishop Manning's decision not to prosecute Dr. Grant for heresy, *viz.*, that the theological controversies provoked by such prosecution would re-act detrimentally on a contemplated effort to raise a large sum of money by voluntary subscription for the diocesan cathedral is asserted by American Modernists to be incorrect. This being so, we not only regret that the statement appeared in the *Modern Churchman*, but also that American Churchmen did not contradict it when it first appeared in the American Secular Press. Editors are not omniscient, and what is published without subsequent contradiction they are justified in assuming to be accurate.

ED.—M.C.